



REPLY TO “ABU ALQAMA” AND HIS NEFARIOUS ATTACKS ON A NARRATION FROM MALIK AL-DAR

Praise be to Allah that is due from all grateful believers, a fullness of praise for all his favours: a praise that is abundantly sincere and blessed. May the blessings of Allah be upon our beloved Master Muhammad, the chosen one, the Apostle of mercy and the seal of all Prophets (peace and blessings of Allah be upon them all); and upon his descendants who are upright and pure: a blessing lasting to the Day of Judgment, like the blessing bestowed upon the Prophet Ibrahim (alaihis salam) and his descendants. May Allah be pleased with all of the Prophetic Companions (Ashab al-Kiram). Indeed, Allah is most worthy of praise and supreme glorification!

In this reply the following narration will be analysed in refutation of a pseudo-Salafi's claims that it is weak and contains an unknown narrator (majhûl) by the name of Malik al-Dar in its chain of transmission (isnâd). The following has been presented here (sunniforum.com) by one of the brothers in documenting the evidences used to endorse the validity of Tawassul.

Imam al-Bayhaqi related with a sound (sahih) chain the following:

It is related from Malik al-Dar, `Umar's treasurer, that the people suffered a drought during the successorship of `Umar, whereupon a man came to the grave of the Prophet and said:

"O Messenger of Allah, ask for rain for your Community, for verily they have but perished," after which the Prophet appeared to him in a dream and told him: "Go to `Umar and give him my greeting, then tell him that they will be watered. Tell him: You must be clever, you must be clever!"

The man went and told `Umar. The latter said: "O my Lord, I spare no effort except in what escapes my power!"

Ibn Kathir cites it thus from Bayhaqi in al-Bidaya wa al-nihaya and says: isnaduhu sahih; Ibn Abi Shayba cites it in his Musannaf with a sound (sahih) chain as confirmed by Ibn Hajar who says: rawa Ibn Abi Shayba bi isnadin sahih and cites the hadith in Fath al-bari. He identifies Malik al-Dar as `Umar's treasurer (khazin `umar) and says that the man who visited and saw the Prophet in his dream is identified as the [Companion Bilal ibn al-Harith](#), and he counts this hadith among the reasons for Bukhari's naming of the chapter "The people's request to their leader for rain if they suffer drought." He also mentions it in al-Isaba, where he says that Ibn Abi Khaythama cited it."

Who is “Abu Alqama”?

“Abu Alqama” is a majhûl in terms of hadith scholarship and he is fanatically attached to the Way of al-Albani, Bin Baz, ibn Uthaymin and their likes. He is most likely the one known as Hassan Ali Khan from France. He has posted here before under multiple identities and is one of those who believe that Allah is literally above the Arsh with settling (istiqrar)! On top of that, he has never denied that Allah literally has two eyes, and a literal Shin. He is also a colleague of Abdoullah al-Ghuzayli’s – the one who dropped shin deep in mistakes and claims with regard to his article on affirming a Saaq for Allah.

Abu Alqama is a product of the Indo-Pak "Ahl-e-hadith" - so he writes and behaves like many of them in his vilification and vehemence against Ahnaf, and any grading of a narration to be authentic that opposes them is usually cut down to shreds - albeit unjustly by going against what major Ulama have said. So his likes approach these types of narrations with the preconceived bias that it is either shirk in essence or leads to it - though he knows very well that not a single one of those earlier Imams who recorded this narration via an Isnad:

[Ibn Abi Shayba in his Musannaf](#)

[Ibn Abi Khaythama](#)

[Ibn Abdal Barr \(partial isnâd\) in his al-Isti’ab](#)

[Al-Bayhaqi in al-Dala’il al-Nubuwwa](#)

[Al-Khalili in al-Irshad](#)

[Ibn Asakir in his Ta’rikh Dimashq](#)

- Ever declared it to be a narration that is consistent with Shirk al-Akbar! On top of that, this person has challenged and opposed the Huffaz who graded the Malik al-Dar narration to be Sahih. If his likes could quote a Hafiz of hadith from the past that held any valid objections to this narration's Isnad, then there would be less need to address these people.

In days gone by, the grading of a Hafiz of hadith was given priority over the saying of a lesser Muhaddith. This being even greater when we consider that those who are attempting to weaken the Isnad of this narration are not well known Hadith scholars, but they themselves usually rely on the arguments of al-Albani and his acolytes. Not one of these contemporaries from that pathless sect is agreed upon to be a Hafiz of Hadith. Hence, little attention or due consideration is given to these claimants to Hadith Mastership; especially so when they oppose the Huffaz of Hadith with flimsy excuses.

What follows is a reply to his claims found on the ahya.org forum.

[quote=Abu Alqama]salam aleykum

Abul Hassan seems not to know anything about ilmu Hadeeth or seems to ignore following his hawa.

Making Someone treasurer does not mean you are thiqah, nut only 'adil, how many good treasurers do forget and have ikhtilat.

Abul Hassan should make a new dicionnaries of jarh and ta'deel and put in it : being Thiqah is being a treassurer.

And being a muhadith of Madeenah is not tawtheeq as well, as many Muhadith bad mad memeories and ikhtilat.

So Abul Hassan should add to his dictionnaris of Jarh and Ta'deel : being a muhadith means being Thiqqah. [/quote]

First of all Ya Abu Alqama, it appears that you feel confident enough in your broken, spelling mistake ridden and hard to decipher English - that you know Hadith better than the likes of Huffaz of Hadith who authenticated the Malik al-Dar narration, originally recorded by Ibn Abi Shayba in al-Musannaf. Rather, it is you and your ilk that follow their hawa on this issue of Tawassul. On top of that, you and your ilk affirm for Allah points that he did not affirm for himself from his kalam or from the Sahih Ahadith! Who

is guiltier in inventing things other than your miniscule sect?! What right do his likes have in talking about what is Shirk and Bid'a when they endorse and affirm Bid'a in beliefs about the attributes of Allah in their anthropomorphic aspersions?!

As for your broken English quote above: “or seems to ignore following his hawâ.”

Then yes, we try to ignore following our desires and rather quote the principles and gradings of established Huffaz of Hadith, unlike you and your paltry pseudo-Salafi sect that only has the likes of al-Albani to weaken what the Huffaz authenticated centuries ago! Who has ever weakened the Malik al-Dar narration before al-Albani hit the scene?

Specifically, this issue of Tawassul was to do with fiqh and not aqeeda, but these Ahlul Ahwa of ahyia.org and their so-called Ulama of today think it is an issue of aqeeda! An issue that leads to Muslims being declared Mushrikin to some of these individuals. Strangely, this majhûl from pseudo-Salafism posted his reply under their section in attacking Deobandi's/Tablighi's – as though this is just a narration specific to them. This in itself is highly deceptive from his likes, for he knows very well that the Malik al-Dar narration was spoken about and mentioned hundreds of years before any contemporary Hanafi subgroups appeared in India.

So this one who used to post on the Sunni Forum under various disguises is the real pretender to the Ilmul-Hadith as he merely followed a similar line of argumentation that his favoured Shuyukh: Al-Albani, Bin Baz, Hammad al-Ansari, al-Jaza'iri etc – did in weakening the narration of Malik al-Dar which was authenticated by earlier Ulama either explicitly or accepted by them without attacking its contents.

So the likes of this pretender to Ilmul-Hadith – has challenged the likes of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani and Hafiz ibn Kathir who both explicitly authenticated this narration under scrutiny! Let the reader now see and decide who these juniors are and what status if any they have in the world of Hadith scholarship. This is the essence of the matter; his likes are saying that they know Hadith better than those earlier agreed upon Hadith masters. One of the signs of Qiyama is that the Asaghir (little one's) and juhala (ignoramus) will be looked upto as being the Ulama of the time, but in reality these are the false claimants to Hadith scholarship and other branches of the Shari'a.

On this issue, we have only tried to base our assertions on authentic quotes to validate our arguments, but his likes usually fail to produce any substantial

validation from a textual basis to augment their claims in opposition to the likes of Ibn Kathir, Ibn Hajar and all those who accepted the narration without attacking its isnâd or matn in any form.

Hence, what this individual was attempting to reply to was not in the main the primary dala'il but merely secondary quotes, which add more strength to the claim of the earlier Ulama that this narration is sound. Those secondary quotes included quotes from Ibn Asakir's Ta'rikh, Ibn Hanbal's al-I'lal etc.

Indeed, Abu Alqama has not been able to name a single Hafiz of Hadith who said that this narration is da'eef, batil or opposes ijma in any form! Rather these types of narrations, like that from al-Utbi where recorded by well known Ulama such as al-Nawawi, Ibn Kathir, Ibn Qudama, al-Qurtubi and others – but we never read from previous scholars that these Imams were spreading shirk! This only goes to show that these are the followers of hawa – for they oppose the Huffaz of hadith and other Ulama who mentioned this narration from Malik al-Dar and other similar narrations.

May be Abu Alqama can tell us if these Ulama are Mushrikin and people of Hawa based on the following references. If he is bold enough let him and his likes clarify it in the clearest words if these Ulama spread Shirk al-Akbar in their works or not:

Al-'Utbi said: "As I was sitting by the grave of the Prophet, a Bedouin Arab came and said: "Peace be upon you, O Messenger of Allah! I have heard Allah saying: ***"If they had only, when they were unjust to themselves, come unto thee and asked Allah's forgiveness, and the Messenger had asked forgiveness for them, they would have found Allah indeed Oft-returning, Most Merciful"*** (4:64), So I have come to you asking forgiveness for my sin, seeking your intercession with my Lord."

Then he began to recite poetry: O best of those whose bones are buried in the deep earth, and from whose fragrance the depth and the height have become sweet, May I be the ransom for a grave which thou inhabit, And in which are found purity, bounty and munificence! Then he left, and I dozed and saw the Prophet in my sleep. He said to me: "O `Utbi, run after the Beduin and give him glad tidings that Allah has forgiven him."¹

¹ Trans by GF Haddad

This report was mentioned by:

1. Al-Nawawi in al-Adhkar, *al-Majmu* 8:217 and *al-Idah fi manasik al-hajj*, chapters on visiting the grave of the Prophet
2. Ibn Jama`a, in *Hidayat al-salik* 3:1384
3. Ibn `Aqil in *al-Tadhkira*
4. Ibn Qudama in *al-Mughni*
5. al-Qurtubi in his *Tafsir of Sura 4:64 in his Ahkam al-Qur'an* (5:265)
6. Al-Samhudi in his *Khulasat al-Wafa*
7. Ibn Kathir in his *Tafsir* 2:306
8. Taqi al-Din al-Subki in *Shifa al-Siqam*
9. Ibn al-Jawzi as in *Muthir al-gharam al-sakin ila ashraf al-amakin* p. 490
10. Ibn Hajar al-Haytami in *al-Jawhar al-munazzam* (commentary on Nawawi's *Idah*) and others.

Or how about the following narration from the Hanbali Hafiz of Hadith, ibn al Jawzi (d. 597 AH) and the actions of some well known Huffaz of hadith:

Al-Hafiz Ibn al-Jawzi relates in *Kitab al-Wafa* (p. 818 #1536): (Al-Hafiz) Abu Bakr al-Minqari² said: "I was with (al-Hafiz) al-Tabarani and (al-Hafiz) Abu al-Shaykh in the Mosque of the Prophet and we were in a predicament. We became very hungry. That day and the next we didn't eat. When it was time for `isha, I came to the Prophet's grave and I said: "O Messenger of Allah, we are hungry, we are hungry!" (*ya rasullallah al-ju` al-ju`*) Then I left. Abu al-Shaykh said to me: "Sit. Either there will be food for us, or death." I slept and Abu al-Shaykh slept. Al-Tabarani stayed awake, researching something. Then an `Alawi (descendant of `Ali) came knocking at the door with two boys, each one carrying a palm-leaf basket filled with food. We sat up and ate. We thought that the children would take back the remainder but they left everything behind. When we finished the `Alawi said: "O people, did you complain to the Prophet? I saw him in my sleep and he ordered me to bring something to you.""³

House of Verification

The last narration is also found in similar wording in the *Siyar a'lam al-Nubala* (16/400-401) of Hafiz Shamsud-Din al-Dhahabi as follows:

وروي عن أبي بكر بن أبي علي، قال: كان ابن المقرئ يقول: كنت أنا والطبراني، وأبو الشيخ بالمدينة، فضايق بنا الوقت، فواصلنا ذلك اليوم، فلما كان وقت العشاء حضرت القبر، وقلت: يا رسول الله الجوع، فقال لي الطبراني: اجلس، فإما أن يكون الرزق أو الموت. فقممت أنا وأبو

² According to al-Dhahabi it is al-Muqri and not al-Minqari

³ Trans by GF Haddad

الشيخ، فحضر الباب علوي، ففتحنا له، فإذا معه غلامان بقفتين فيهما شيء كثير، وقال: شكوتوني إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ رأيته في النوم، فأمرني بحمل شيء إليكم

Or how will Abu Alqama treat al-Dhahabi for saying that Tabarruk is gained from the Qabr of Abul Hasan al-Dhuhli? In his *Siyar a'lam* (18/100) he said:

الذهلي إمام جامع همدان، وركن السنة، أبو الحسن، علي بن حميد بن علي الذهلي، الهمداني. روى عن: أبي بكر بن لال، وابن تركان، وأحمد بن محمد البصير، وأبي عمر بن مهدي، وطبقته. روى عنه: يوسف بن محمد الخطيب، وغيره. وكان ورعا، تقيا، محتشما، يتبرك بقبره. مات سنة اثنتين وخمسين وأربع مئة وقد قارب الثمانين

Will Abu Alqama step forward and say that these Ulama are all Quburiyya, nay Mushrikin? Or will he say that these narrations are fabrications and make up more excuses without a valid source to back his claims?

Or will you say that the likes of Imam al-Dhahabi were spreaders of Khurafat? See how your Ulama dealt with al-Dhahabi:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=6401>

Or may be you wish to attack al-Shawkani for permitting Tawassul – when you probably know that your Ulama like Nawab Siddiq Hasan and others admired him and spread his Asanid in Hadith!

Al-Shawkani on Tawassul:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=11906>

Or may be we should dig deeper and show what earlier Indian “Ahl-e-hadith” said about Tawassul?!

Tell us if this is Shirk al-Akbar from the words of those your Pathless Madhhab adores when it suits them –

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=14815>

Continuing:

It has already been mentioned above those Imams who mentioned this narration from Malik al-Dar with their Asanid (chains of transmission).

It was explicitly authenticated by:

Al-Hafiz Ibn Kathir in al-Bidaya wal Nihaya and his Jami al-Masanid
And al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in his Fath al-Bari

It was mentioned without criticism of its isnâd or matn by:

Imam Taqi al-Subki in his Shifa al-Siqam (p. 174) – and may be Abu Alqama can see if Ibn Abdal Hadi weakened it in his Sarim al-Munki?

Imam Nurud-Din al-Samhudi in Wafa al-Wafa (p. 1374)
Imam Al-Qastallani in al-Mawahib al-Laduniyya (8/77)
Imam Ibn Hajar al-Haytami in al-Jawhar al-Munazzam (p. 62)

O those who follow their hawa – did any of those named Ulama say that this narration opposes Ijma, is da’eef, batil, mawdu or leads to Shirk al-Akbar?! Did Ibn Taymiyya say this narration is full of shirk in his al-Iqtida al-Sirat al-Mustaqim?

As for his attacks regarding the making up of new dictionaries of Jarh wa Ta’dil then there is no need for that unbecoming piece of sarcastic advice – since all that we mentioned was based on Imam Ibn Asakir mentioning that Imam Ibn Ma’een said that Malik al-Dar was from the Muhaddithin of Madina and the established fact that Malik was the treasurer of Umar (ra) from the words of other experts.

We did not say that these two points lead to the automatic declaration that Malik al-Dar must then be absolutely Thiqa (trustworthy). But I did say that such a wise man like Umar ibn al-Khattab (ra) would probably have

appointed Malik as his treasurer based on the premise that he must have been a sâlih and adil man in his affairs; and if one was the keeper of the Baytul Mal – one would expect that Malik would have the skill to record the incoming and outgoing funds of the Bayt al-Mal with meticulous precision. This becomes even more conclusive when we know that no one from the Salaf attacked Malik al-Dar in a negative way, let alone saying that he is absolutely majhul. Rather, it is known that some have listed Malik as being a Sahabi! If the latter is the case then Malik's veracity is no longer questioned for Ahlus Sunna hold all the Sahaba to be adil in the riwâya of Ahadith.

Thus, Abu Alqama, the one who looks to seek out the worst possible misinterpretation had no basis to attack us on mentioning these points from the *Ta'rikh al-Dimashq* of al-Hafiz ibn Asakir.

Can he prove that Umar (ra) appointed a treasurer who in Abu Alqama's broken English may have been:

“how many good treasurers do forget and have ikhtilat.”?! Name your sources that affirm such a claim.

Indeed, al-Hafiz ibn Hajar mentioned in his *al-Isaba fî-Tamyiz al-Sahaba*, under the entry on Malik al-Dar the following point on how he served under two rightly guided Caliphs:

“Abu `Ubayda said of him: ‘Umar put him in charge of the dependents in his household. When `Uthman succeeded him, he put him in charge of financial allotments and he was then named Malik of the House.’”

House of Verification

Points of benefit for Abu Alqama – according to his own Muhaddith al-Asr: Nasir al-Albani

A look at how al-Albani declared a sanad to be Hasan due to one man being called a Muhaddith by Khatib al-Baghdadi alone:

Now, Abu Alqama - Your Imam, al-Albani in his Silsila al-Sahiha (1/49) mentioned the following:

الأول : قال المخلص في " الفوائد المنتقاة " في " الثاني من السادس منها " (ق 1 / 190) : حدثنا يحيى (يعني ابن صاعد) قال : حدثنا الجراح بن مخلد قال : حدثنا يحيى بن العريان الهروي قال : حدثنا حاتم بن إسماعيل عن أسامة بن زيد عن نافع عنه .
و بهذا السند رواه الدارقطني (36) و عنه ابن الجوزي , و رواه الخطيب في " الموضح " (1 / 111) عن ابن صاعد , و في " التاريخ " (14 / 161) من طريقين آخرين عن الجراح بن مخلد به .
و هذا سند حسن عندي , فإن رجاله كلهم ثقات معروفون غير الهروي هذا فقد ترجمه الخطيب و لم يذكر فيه جرحا و لا تعديلا , غير أنه وصفه بأنه كان محدثا .

The coloured part shows that al-Harawi had no Jarh or Ta'dil on him except that he was known as a Muhaddith to Khatib al-Baghdadi. With this in mind – Al-Albani still went ahead and declared a sanad to be Hasan!

This is what al-Khatib mentioned about the narrator Yahya ibn al-Uryan al-Harawi in his *Ta'rikh*:

[7474] يحيى بن العريان الهروي نزل بغداد وحدث بها عن حاتم بن إسماعيل روى عنه الجراح بن مخلد البصري قرأت في كتاب أبي الحسن بن الفرات بخطه أخبرنا محمد بن العباس الضبي الهروي حدثنا أبو إسحاق أحمد بن محمد بن ياسين قال يحيى بن العريان الهروي بن عم بنى نجدة

كان ببغداد محدثاً أخبرنا محمد بن عثمان بن سعيد وجعفر بن أحمد قالا حدثنا الجراح بن مخلد البصري حدثنا يحيى بن العريان حدثنا حاتم بن إسماعيل عن أسامة بن زيد عن نافع عن بن عمر ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال الأذان من الراس

This quote shows as al-Albani mentioned – there is no Jarh or Ta’dil on Yahya al-Harawi – but al-Khatib mentioned that he was only known as the Muhaddith of Baghdad and just one narrator took from him (al-Jarrah ibn Makhlad al-Basri).

So how is it O Abu Alqama that your Shaykh al-Albani declared a sanad to be Hasan when it contains a man with no Jarh or Ta’dil on him – but just that he was known as the Muhaddith of Baghdad?! On top of that – al-Jarrah ibn Makhlad was declared Thiqa by Ibn Hajar (*al-Taqreeb*, no. 907) – and according to al-Khatib’s claim, he is the only one who took from Yahya al-Harawi.

What is now stopping your likes from taking al-Albani’s own principle that if a man has no Jarh or Ta’dil on him, but is known as a Muhaddith of a City the sanad can be declared Hasan if all the others in the sanad are Thiqa?!

What is stopping you or us for that matter from taking this Albani’ite principle and applying the same to Malik al-Dar?! If your likes believed that Malik is majhûl and there is no Jarh or Ta’dil on him then why don’t you now accept this qa’ida that as long as a man is a Muhaddith of a well known city – like Malik al-Dar was said to be in Madina by Imam Yahya ibn Ma’een – then as long as the rest of the narrators are sound the whole isnad can be declared at least Hasan?! Or will you dare to attack and mock al-Albani for his tahsin of a sanad due to a man being known as a Muhaddith when no further Jarh or Ta’dil is mentioned about him?

For the readers benefit, the above example shows conclusively that al-Albani declared a sanad to be Hasan because:

A man known as Yahya al-Harawi had no praise or dispraise on him except that he was known as a Muhaddith of Baghdad!

The same principle should be followed by the die hard Albani’ites; for Malik al-Dar has no Jarh on him but he has been called a Muhaddith by Yahya ibn Ma’een as mentioned by Ibn Asakir in his *al-Ta’rikh*.

The reason why Malik should be deemed *thiqa* is due to relying on the fact that earlier Huffaz like Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Hibban, and al-Khalili had strongly indicated praiseworthy remarks (*tawthiq*) are present for Malik al-Dar's veracity as a Rawi of authentic narrations, and on this basis we can clearly see that the likes of Ibn Kathir and ibn Hajar must have declared Malik to be at least *saduq* if not *thiqa* in Hadith. In the case of ibn Hajar it seems clear that he thought Malik al-Dar to be a Sahabi in his *al-Isaba fi Tamyiz al-Sahaba*. Indeed, this will be examined further with clear examples from the books of al-Jarh wa Ta'dil.

On top of that, there are at least 4 Ulama from the Huffaz who went to the level of suggesting that Malik was a Sahabi. These Imams were:

Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH) in his *Tajrid Asma al-Sahaba* (2/51, no. 529)

Ibn Hajar (d. 852 AH) in *al-Isaba fi Tamyiz al-Sahaba*

Ibn Fahd al-Makki (d. 871 AH) in his *Mukhtasar Asma al-Sahaba* ⁴

Al-Zarqani in his *Sharh Mawahib al-Laduniyya* (8/77)

Here are the quotes in Ta'dil of Malik al-Dar that Abu Alqama and his likes rejected with no shred of evidence from any earlier source:

Ibn Sa'd in his *Tabaqat* mentioned:

Malik al-Dar: 'Umar ibn al-Khattab's freedman. He narrated from Abu Bakr and 'Umar. He was known (ka'na ma'rufan)

Ibn Hibban has attested to the trustworthiness of Malik ad-Dar by listing him in his *Kitab-uth-thiqat* (5:384).

Abu Yala al-Khalili in his *al-Irshad*:

Malik al-Dar: muttafaq alayhi athna alayhi al-tabi'un -- He is agreed upon, the Successors have praised him..

⁴ See http://i51.photobucket.com/albums/f378/faqir/w6w_200601172019092be35d4c.jpg

Meaning: That he is agreed upon to be Thiqa since his adala has been established and the Tabi'in have praised him for his rank and status.

In due course it will be shown what the term Ma'ruf and Muttafaq alayhi meant to the likes of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani as well as al-Khalili clarifying what he meant by Muttafaq alaihi.

Ibn Hajar 'Asqalānī in al-Isaba fi-Tamyiz al-Sahaba mentioned:

*"Malik ibn 'Iyad: 'Umar's freedman. He is the one named Malik al-Dar. **He has seen the Prophet** and has heard narrations from Abu Bakr al-Siddiq. He has narrated from Abu Bakr and 'Umar, Mu'adh, and Abu 'Ubayda. From him narrated **Abu Salih al-Saman** and his (Malik's) two sons **'Awn and 'Abd Allah...Bukhari in his Tarikh** narrated through Abu Salih Dhakwan from Malik al-Dar that 'Umar said during the period of drought: "O my Lord, I spare no effort except in what escapes my power!" Ibn Abi Khaythama also narrated it in those words but in a longer hadith: The people suffered a drought during the time of 'Umar, whereupon a man came to the grave of the Prophet and said: "O Messenger of Allah, ask Allah for rain for your Community." The Prophet appeared to him in a dream and told him: "Go, see 'Umar and tell him: You will be watered, and: You must put your nose to the grindstone ('alayk al-kaffayn)."* (The man went and told 'Umar.) Then 'Umar wept and exclaimed: "O my Lord, I spare no effort except in what escapes my power!" We have also narrated in the Fawa'id of Dawud ibn 'Amr and al-Dabbi compiled by al-Baghawi in the narration of **'Abd al-Rahman ibn Sa'id ibn Yarbu' al-Makbuzi** from Malik al-Dar: he said: "'Umar ibn al-Khattab summoned me one day. He had with him a purse of gold containing four hundred dinars. He said: "Take this to Abu 'Ubayda," and he mentioned the rest of the story. **Ibn Sa'd** mentioned him (Malik al-Dar) in the first layer of the Successors among the people of Madina and said: "He narrated from Abu Bakr and 'Umar, and he was known." Abu 'Ubayda said of him: "'Umar put him in charge of the dependents in his household. When 'Uthman succeeded him, he put him in charge of financial allotments and he was then named Malik of the House." Isma'il al-Qadi related from 'Ali ibn al-Madini: "Malik al-Dar was 'Umar's treasurer.""

As for Malik al-Dar being the treasurer of Umar (ra), then naturally he was working under the direct command of a rightly guided Caliph. As for Abu Alqama saying:

"Abul Hassan should make a new dictionaries of jarh and ta'deel and put in it : being Thiqa is being a treasurer."

Our reliance is on the way of the earlier Ulama of al-Jarh wa Ta'dil and their true successors and explainers like the recognised Amir al-Mu'min fil hadith in his age: Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani.

Being a treasurer of Umar (ra) is not an ultimate mode of tawthiq for any narrator unless some authoritative Ulama mentioned that based on some form of recognised terminology.

Indeed, see how Ibn Kathir whom the pseudo-Salafiyya claim as one of their respected Ulama said the following about another pious Caliph, Umar ibn Abdal Aziz in his *al-Bidaya wal Nihaya* (9/105)

وقد صرح كثير من الأئمة بأن كل من استعمله عمر بن عبد العزيز ثقة

Anyhow, Abu Alqama needs to show why being a Muhaddith of a city is a form of tawthiq that al-Albani utilised to make tahsin of a sanad! Will he say that al-Albani invented his own terminology and introduced it into his own "dictionary"?!

[quote=Abu Alqama]

"Imam Ibn Asakir did not attack the narration in any way" :

So all muhadith who narrates from people and do not weaken them, then its narrators are thiqqa, so all majhool in books of hadeeth and muhadith narrating them not saying they are majhool, then it is taqtheeq

Abul Hassan should add third rule to his book of Jarh and Ta'deel : A Muhadith narrating from someone and not weakening it will make its narrator thiqqah.

Abul hassan said : "In the I'lal wa Ma'rifat al-Rijal (vol. 1) of Imam Ibn Hanbal – there is an indication that Malik al-Dar was not majhûl to Imam Ibn Hanbal"

Where did Imam Ahmad declared Malik dar to be thiqah ?

Fourth rule of Abul Hassan : If a muhadith mentions that this man did hear of someone else, then it is an indication of him to be thiqah. [/quote]

What was mentioned about Ibn Asakir not weakening the narration was not to deduce that he authenticated the narration but to show that he did not consider the narration to be batil, opposing ijma or a narration leading to Shirk al-Akbar as the likes of the Ahlul Ahwa decipher with no quotes from the earlier Huffaz of Hadith! Then again, let the likes of Abu Alqama apply this line of argument from his last quote to al-Albani who declared a sanad to be Hasan on the mere basis that just one trustworthy narrator took from Yahya al-Harawi, and on the basis that he was known as a Muhaddith of Baghdad!

As for the quote from the I'lal of ibn Hanbal – it was never used to suggest that Ibn Hanbal made tawthiq on Malik, hence Abu Alqama asks rhetorical questions based on twisted mis-readings of what I merely quoted from Ibn Hanbal which was introduced to show that no where did Ibn Hanbal consider Malik to be da'eef, but it went to show that Ibn Hanbal affirmed that Malik did hear from Umar (ra) and that Abu Salih al-Samman did hear from Malik. It is as simple as that.

The problem with Abu Alqama is his biased and fanatical sarcasm, which leads to reading too much into a quote and deciphering a completely unjust conclusion(s)!

Point of benefit:

There is no break in the sanad between Abu Salih al-Samman and Malik al-Dar

Note, the likes of the Ahlul Ahwa went to the level of claiming that there is a break in the chain between Abu Salih al-Samman and Malik al-Dar – and they said this without any proof from the earlier Huffaz. Some of these Huffaz who explicitly affirmed this hearing of Abu Salih from Malik include the following six authorities:

i) Ibn Sa'd' in his *al-Tabaqat* (5/12) mentioned:

روى عنه أبو صالح السمان وكان معروفاً

ii) Ibn Hanbal in his *al-I'lal wa Ma'rifat al-rijal* (vol. 1, no. 464) affirmed:

ومالك الدار روى عنه أبو صالح السمان

iii) Ibn Abi Hatim in *al-Jarh wa Ta'dil* (8/213) mentioned:

مالك بن عياض مولى عمر بن الخطاب روى عن ابي بكر الصديق وعمر بن الخطاب رضى الله
عنهما روى عنه أبو صالح السمان سمعت ابي يقول ذلك

iv) Ibn Hibban in *al-Thiqat* (5/384) mentioned:

روى عنه أبو صالح السمان ، وكان مولى لعمر بن الخطاب

v) Al-Khalili in *al-Irshad* (1/313) mentioned under the Malik al-Dar narration:

إن أبا صالح سمع مالك الدار هذا الحديث

vi) Ibn Asakir in his *Ta'rikh Dimashq* (no. 7180) mentioned:

مالك بن عياض المعروف بمالك الدار المدني مولى عمر بن الخطاب ويقال الجبلاي سمع أبا بكر -
الصديق وعمر بن الخطاب وأبا عبيدة بن الجراح ومعاذ بن جبل وروى عنه أبو صالح السمان
وعبد الرحمن بن سعيد بن يربوع وابناه عون بن مالك وعبد الله بن مالك

Hence, the likes of Abu Alqama merely misread and make out their own crooked conclusions due to over enthusiastic rhetorical insinuations!

As for the issue of accepting or rejecting narrations from those who are allegedly majhûl al-ayn or majhûl al-haal/mastur – what relevance has this to Malik al-Dar? Who said he was majhûl from the Salafus-Salihin who specialised in al-Jarh wa Ta'dil? If he were majhûl then why would the likes of Ibn Kathir declare the sanad back to him to be Sahih?

As for Hafiz al-Mundhiri in his *al-Targhib wal-Tarhib* and Hafiz al-Haythami in his *Majma al-Zawa'id* saying that they didn't know who Malik al-Dar was, then this is not a proof that he was majhûl. It only shows that these two later Huffaz, one of whom was the Shaykh of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar, did not find any

biographical information on Malik. The one who is in the know about the facts behind Malik al-Dar is a proof over the claims of the one who did not know.

Indeed, Malik al-Dar is not majhûl and his status is not determined merely on the reliance of Ibn Hibban's tawthiq, but also on what Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili mentioned. On top of this it has been mentioned that 4 known Ulama of Hadith regarded Malik al-Dar to be a Sahabi. These Ulama don't just pull out these claims from thin air; rather they must have had an earlier reference from the early Muslims to arrive at such a declaration. Just because we may not know precisely what those early sources were that mentioned or listed Malik from the Sahaba, it is not an absolute reason to deny him the rank of Sahabi. Granted, we know that some earlier Ulama have made clarification that Malik was from the Tabi'in. All this demonstrates is that there is a difference of opinion on whether he was a Sahabi or a Tabi'i.

Let us look at an example of a narrator known as **Sharik ibn Hanbal** whose status is disputed in terms of whether he was a Sahabi or a Tabi'i. Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani mentioned in his Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (vol. 4)

[585] شريك بن حنبل العبسي الكوفي قال البخاري وقال بعضهم بن شرحبيل وهو وهم روى عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مرسلا وعن علي روى عنه أبو إسحاق السبيعي وعمير بن تميم الثعلبي قال بن أبي حاتم عن أبيه ليست له صحبة ومن الناس من يدخله في المسند **وذكره بن حبان في الثقات** روى له حديثا في الثوم قلت وقال من قال شريك بن حنبل فقد وهم عكس ما قال البخاري وقال صاحب الميزان لا يدري من هو وذكره بن سعد في التابعين وقال **كان معروفا** قليل الحديث وقال بن السكن روى عنه حديث واحد قيل فيه شريك عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وقيل شريك عن علي وقال العسكري لا تثبت له صحبة وأورد بن مندة حديثه وفيه التصريح بسماعه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم ذكر أنه روى عنه عن علي وهو الصواب

This narrator had two students who took from him – Abu Ishaq al-Sabi'i and Umayr ibn Tamim al-Tha'labi

Ibn Hibban listed him in his Thiqat

The author of al-Mizan (al-Dhahabi) said that he didn't know who Sharik was (Looking at the Mizan this is what al-Dhahabi mentioned:

3693 – شريك بن حنبل [د ، ت] . له عن علي . وعنه أبو إسحاق السبيعي ، وعمير بن تميم . لا يدري من هو ، ووثقه ابن حبان

This shows that al-Dhahabi only knew that Ibn Hibban listed him in his Thiqat – but since al-Dhahabi didn't know him – it was an indication to him that Sharik was majhûl al-haal. Al-Dhahabi didn't know of ibn Sa'ds grading to mention)

Ibn Sa'd listed him as being from the 'Tabi'in and he explicitly said about Sharik: **Kana Ma'rufan – “He was Known”** – though he had few hadiths

Ibn Abi Hatim mentioned no Jarh or Ta'dil on Sharik as well as mentioning that he was not a Sahabi as his father mentioned

Also, it is noted that al-Bukhari mentioned no Jarh or Ta'dil on Sharik in his Ta'rikh al-Kabir:

[2648] شريك بن حنبل العباسي سمع عليا روى عنه أبو إسحاق وعمير بن قميم يعد في الكوفيين وقال بعضهم بن شرحبيل وهو وهم

Al-Bukhari's silence on a narrator's adala is taken by some Ulama to mean that this is a form of tawthiq on the narrator by al-Bukhari. See later for the quote from al-Hafiz al-Ishbili from the Ta'rikh of al-Bukhari that was in his possession in Andalusia in the 5th Islamic century.

A contrast of the above points with Malik al-Dar:

i) Malik al-Dar is also listed in Kitab al-Thiqat of ibn Hibban – where he mentioned that only Abu Salih al-Samman took from him – (though it is also known that Abdur Rahman ibn Sa'eed ibn Yarbu also took from him – and this narrator is also Thiqat)

ii) Ibn Sa'd said the same phrase again with Malik as he did with Sharik: “Ka'na Ma'rufan” (Note, this is what he said about Malik in his Tabaqat under the first category of the 'Tabi'in from Madina:

مالك الدار مولى عمر بن الخطاب , وقد انضموا إلى جبلان من حمير , وروى مالك الدار عن أبي بكر الصديق وعمر رجهما الله . روى عنه أبو صالح السمان , وكان معروفا

iii) There is also Ikhtilaf on whether Malik is a Tabi'i or a Sahabi, just as with Sharik

iv) Ibn Abi Hatim mentioned no Jarh or Ta'dil on Malik in his *Kitab al-Jarh wa Ta'dil*

v) The last point also applies to al-Bukhari's *Ta'rikh al-Kabir* where he noted no Jarh or Ta'dil on Malik

The two most important points above are that Ibn Hibban accepted Sharik to be Thiqa as he did with Malik and Ibn Sa'd declared both Sharik and Malik to be known (ka'na ma'rufan)

The question now is if this is enough to say that Sharik is at least Saduq or Thiqa to skilled validators of the status of narrators like al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani or not?!

The answer is found by looking into his *Taqreeb al-Tahdhib*. Under Sharik ibn Hanbal, al-Hafiz ibn Hajar said:

[2785] شريك بن حنبل العباسي الكوفي وقيل بن شرحبيل ثقة من الثانية ولم يثبت أن له

صحبة د ت

Here, al-Hafiz declared Sharik to be Thiqa (trustworthy) – and this conclusion was derived by him with just specifically mentioning that Ibn Sa'd had said that Sharik was known and that Ibn Hibban had listed him in al-Thiqat. This shows that what Ibn Sa'd said (Ka'na Ma'rufan - He was known) about Sharik and Malik is a positive expression of Ta'dil (praiseworthy accreditation) on a narrator according to al-Hafiz al-Waqt – Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani.

On top of this, let us see what al-Dhahabi declared in his final grading on Sharik in his *al-Kashif*:

[2274] شريك بن حنبل العباسي عن علي وعنه أبو إسحاق وعمير بن تميم وثق د ت

Al-Dhahabi said that Sharik was Wathiqah – meaning reliable, which is also a form of ta'dil to him.

This example shows that if Sharik is 'Thiqah to Ibn Hajar based on just two verdicts from Ibn Hibban and Ibn Sa'd, then all the more likely is it that Malik al-Dar is 'Thiqah – since he has also been positively accredited by al-Hafiz Abu Ya'la al-Khalili (see below).

Let us see how al-Albani graded a narration from this same Sharik ibn Hanbal.

In his editing of *Jami al-Tirmidhi* (no. 1808), under the following narration:

حدثنا محمد بن مديونة حدثنا مسدد حدثنا الجراح بن مليح والد وكيع عن أبي إسحاق عن **شريك بن حنبل** عن علي أنه قال : **فهي عن أكل الثوم إلا مطبوخا**

Al-Albani declared this narration to be Sahih! Abu Alqama needs to explain why his own “Muhaddith al-Asr” graded this narration to be Sahih when Sharik has virtually the same form of Ta'dil as Malik al-Dar, who was declared majhul by Abu Alqama and al-Albani in his work on Tawassul!

A look at the meaning of al-Khalili's words – “Mutafaq alaihi”- “Agreed upon”

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani in his *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib* relied on the words of Jarh and Ta'dil expressed by Imam Abu Ya'la al-Khalili on several occasions. This shows that al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar regarded al-Khalili to be an authoritative figure in validating the status of narrators prior to his time. There is no valid reason known to us why al-Khalili cannot be utilised to clarify the final status of narrators from the earliest times. To reject the grading's of the likes of al-Khalili one needs to provide some valid statements from the Masters of Hadith to invalidate the status or grading of al-Khalili on specific examples from his *Kitab al-Irshad*.

Al-Hafiz Abu Ya'la Al-Khalili said the following about Malik al-Dar in his al-Irshad

مالك الدار مولى عمر بن الخطاب الرعاء عنه : تابعي , قديم , متفق عليه , أثنى عليه التابعون , وليس بكثير الرواية , روى عن أبي بكر الصديق , وعمر , وقد انتسب ولده إلى جيلان ناحية . حدثني محمد بن أحمد بن عبدوس المزكي أبو بكر النيسابوري , حدثنا عبد الله بن محمد بن الحسن الشرقي , حدثنا محمد بن عبد الوهاب قال : قلت لعلي بن عثام العامري الكوفي : لم سمي مالك الدار ؟ فقال : الداري المتطيب . حدثنا محمد بن الحسن بن الفتح , حدثنا عبد الله بن محمد البغوي , حدثنا أبو خيثمة , حدثنا محمد بن خازم الضرير , حدثنا الأعمش , عن أبي صالح , عن مالك الدار , قال : أصاب الناس قحط في زمان عمر بن الخطاب , فجاء رجل إلى قبر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال : يا نبي الله , استسق الله لأمتك فرأى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في المنام فقال : " أتت عمر , فأقرئه السلام , وقل له : إنكم مسقون , فعليك بالكيس الكيس " . قال : فبكى عمر , وقال : يا رب , ما آلو إلا ما عجزت عنه يقال : إن أبا صالح سمع مالك الدار هذا الحديث , والباقون أرسلوه

The underlined part is crucial to determine if al-Khalili made tawthiq on Malik. He said:

Tabi'i qadeem, Muttafaq alayhi, athna alayhi al-tabi-un – An old standing successor (Tabi'i), He is agreed upon, the Successors have praised him..

Let us look at what this term Muttafaq alayhi – (He is agreed upon) means to those who know best the language and expressions linked to al-Jarh wa Ta'dil. In general Muttafaq Alayhi is linked to the agreement of Imam al-Bukhari and Imam Muslim on the authenticity and recording of a Hadith in their respective Sahih collections.

Ibn Hajar in his *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib* (vol. 5) mentioned the following on a well known Muhaddith of early times, whose name was Abbas al-Duri:

[226] 4 الأربعة عباس بن محمد بن حاتم بن واقد الدوري أبو الفضل البغدادي مولى بني هاشم خوارزمي الأصل روى عن سعيد بن عامر الضبعي وأسود بن عامر شاذان وأبي الجواب أحوص بن جواب وإسحاق بن منصور السلولي وحسين بن علي الجعفي وحسين بن محمد المروزي

وخالد بن مخلد وأبي داود الطيالسي وأبي عبد الرحمن المقرئ وقراد أبي نوح وعبد الرحمن بن مصعب القطان وأبي عامر العقدي وعبد الله بن يزيد وعبد الوهاب الحفاف وعبيد الله بن موسى ويوسف بن منازل ويونس بن محمد المؤدب وعلي بن الحسن بن شقيق المروزي وعمرو بن هارون المقرئ وأبو نعيم الفضل بن دكين ويحيى بن أبي بكير الكرماني وعفان وخلق كثير وعنه الأربعة ويعقوب بن سفيان وهو من أقرانه وأبو العباس بن شريح الفقيه وابن أبي الدنيا وابن أبي حاتم وأبو عبيد الآجري وجعفر بن محمد الفريابي وابنه محمد بن جعفر وعبيد الله بن أحمد والحسين الحاملي ومحمد بن مخلد ويحيى بن صاعد والبعوي وأبو جعفر بن البحري وإسماعيل الصفار وحمزة بن محمد بن الدهقان وأبو الحسين الآدمي وأبو العباس الأصم وخلق قال بن أبي حاتم صدوق سمعت منه مع أبي وسئل عنه أبي فقال صدوق وقال النسائي ثقة وقال الأصم لم أر في مشائخي أحسن حديثاً منه وذكره يحيى بن معين فقال صديقنا وصاحبنا وذكر عبد الله بن أحمد أن مولده سنة 185 وقال أبو الحسين بن المنادي مات يوم الثلاثاء نصف صفر سنة إحدى وسبعين ومائتين وقد بلغ ثمانيا وثمانين سنة وفيها أرحه حمزة الدهقان قلت وقال مسلمة ثقة وذكره بن حبان في الثقات **وقال الخليلي في الإرشاد متفق عليه يعني على عدالته** وإلا فالشيخان لم يخرج له واحد منهما

This narrator had no Jarh against him according to the above quote and tawthiq was made on him by:

Ibn Abi Hatim and his father
Al-Nasa'i
Ibn Ma'een said he was our truthful friend and companion
Maslama
Ibn Hibban

House of Verification

While al-Khalili said in al-Irshad about Abbas:

**“Muttafaq Alaihi ya’ni ala adalatihi” –
“Agreed upon, meaning upon his probity”**

This is a clear cut clarification from the words of Imam al-Khalili that when he declared a narrator to be “Agreed upon-Muttafaq alaihi” – It means that the earlier Huffaz have generally agreed that such a narrator had mainly words of Ta’dil on his status as a veritable narrator of sound narrations. This is a clarification that such a narrator is no doubt thiqa or at least saduq to al-Khalili, and Ta’dil was generally mentioned on such a narrator. This type of

decision made by al-Khalili would have been derived on what he knew from the statements of earlier experts in Jarh wa Ta'dil.

Ibn Hajar graded Abbas al-Duri to be a 'Thiqa Hafiz (trustworthy preserver of narrations) in al-Taqrīb (no. 3189)

Other examples from Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib al-Tahdhib:

From vol. 10, the narrator Ma'n ibn Isa whose narrations are found in the Sihah Sitta:

[454] ع الستة معن بن عيسى بن يحيى بن دينار الأشجعي مولاهم القزاز أبو يحيى المدني أحد أئمة الحديث روى عن إبراهيم بن طهمان وأبي بن العباس بن سهل بن سعد ومعاوية بن صالح ومالك بن أنس وأبي الغصن ثابت بن قيس وخارجة بن عبد الله بن سليمان بن زيد ثابت وعبد العزيز بن المطلب وابن أبي ذئب ومحمد بن مسلم الطائفي وهشام بن سعد وعبد الرحمن بن أبي الموالي وموسى بن يعقوب الزمعي وغيرهم روى عنه إبراهيم المنذر الحرمي ويحيى بن معين وعلي بن المدني والحميدي وأبو بكر بن أبي شيبة ومحمد بن يحيى بن أبي عمر وعيسى بن إسحاق بن الطباع وإسحاق بن موسى الأنصاري وعبد الله بن جعفر البرمكي والفضل بن الصباح ومحمد بن أحمد بن أبي خلف وأبو خيثمة وقتيبة ونصر بن علي وهارون بن عبد الله الحمالي وصالح بن مسمار والحسين بن عيسى البسطامي ويونس بن عبد الأعلى وآخرون قال الميموني عن أحمد ما كتبت عنه شيئا وقال إسحاق بن موسى سمعته يقول كان مالك لا يجيب العراقيين في شيء من الحديث حتى أكون أنا أسأله وقال أبو حاتم أثبت أصحاب مالك وأتقنهم معن بن عيسى وهو أحب إلي من بن وهب وقال بن سعد كان يعالج القن يشتره مات بالمدينة في شوال سنة ثمان وتسعين ومائة وكان ثقة كثير الحديث ثبتا مأمونا قلت وقال إبراهيم بن الجنيد قلت ليحيى بن معين كان عند معن شيء غير الموطأ قال قليل قال يحيى وإنما قصدنا إليه في حديث مالك قلت فكيف هو في حديث مالك قال ثقة وذكره بن حبان في الثقات وقال كان هو الذي يتولى القراءة على مالك وقال الخليلي قديم متفق عليه رضي الشافعي بروايته

Al-Khalili declared this narrator to be “Qadeem Muttafaq alaihi”: “Of old standing, agreed upon”

Ibn Hajar declared Ma'n ibn Isa to be Thiqa Thabat – Trustworthy and firmly established in al-Taqrīb (no. 6820).

Under the biography of Abdur Rahman ibn al Qasim (the one who took the Muwatta of Imam Malik to Egypt) in al-Tahdhib al-Tahdhib (vol. 6)

[503] خ مد س البخاري وأبي داود في المراسيل والنسائي عبد الرحمن بن القاسم بن خالد بن جنادة العتقي أبو عبد الله المصري الفقيه روى عن مالك الحديث والمسائل وعن بكر بن مضر ونافع بن أبي نعيم القاري ويزيد بن عبد الملك النوفلي وابن عيينة وغيرهم وعنه ابنه موسى وأصبغ بن الفرغ وسعيد بن عيسى بن تليد ومحمد بن سلمة المرادي والحارث بن مسكين وسحنون بن سعيد وعبد الرحمن بن أبي الغمر المصري ومحمد بن عبد الله بن عبد الحكم وعيسى بن حماد زغبة وغيرهم قال أبو زرعة مصري ثقة رجل صالح كان عنده ثلاثمائة جلدًا ونحوه عن مالك مسائل مما سأله أسد رجل من العرب كان سأل محمد بن الحسن عن مسائل وأتى بن وهب وسأله أن يجيب بما كان عنده عن مالك وما لم يكن عنده عن مالك فمن عنده فأبى فأتى عبد الرحمن بن القاسم فأجابه على هذا فالناس يتكلمون في هذه المسائل قال النسائي ثقة مأمون أحد الفقهاء وقال الحاكم ثقة مأمون وقال الخطيب ثقة وقال بن يونس ذكر أحمد بن شعيب النسوي ونحن عنده عبد الرحمن بن القاسم فأحسن الثناء عليه وأطنب وذكره بن حبان في الثقات قال كان خيرا فاضلا ممن تفقهه على مالك وفرع على أصوله وذب عنها ونصر من انتحلها قال يونس بن عبد الأعلى مات في صفر سنة إحدى وتسعين ومائة وقيل إن مولده سنة 28 وقيل إحدى وقيل اثنتين وثلاثين له في صحيح البخاري حديثا واحدا قلت وقال مسلمة بن قاسم كان فقيه البدن من ثقات أصحاب مالك وكان ورعا صالحا ولم يكن صاحب حديث وقال أحمد بن محمد الحضرمي سألت يحيى بن معين عنه فقال ثقة ثقة وقال بن وضاح لم يكن عند بن القاسم إلا الموطأ الذي روى عن مالك وسماعه من مالك يعني المسائل كان يحفظهما حفظا حكي ذلك سحنون وغيره قال ورآه بن معبد في المنام فسأله كيف وجدت المسائل فقال أف أف فما أحسن ما وجدت قال الرباط قال ورأيت بن وهب أحسن حالا منه وقال الخليلي زاهد متفق عليه أول من حمل الموطأ إلى مصر وهو إمام

Ibn al Qasim was declared to be a **Zahid Muttafaq alaihi – Ascetic, agreed upon.**

Ibn Hajar declared him to be a Faqih, a companion of Imam Malik's and Thiqa (in hadith) in his Taqrīb (no. 3980)

[quote=Abu Alqama]

Then Abul Hassan said two thiqah narrators narrated from Malik Dar, and it is well known, one can see in 'Tayseer mustalah al hadeeth of Tahan AL Hanafi that if two or more thiqqah narrates from a majhool then this narrator is Mastoor of Majhool of Hal, and it is not declaring him thiqqah.

So Abul Hassan has a fifth rule : two thiqqa narrators narrating from a majhool make this majhool thiqah.

Abul Hassan said : Hence, since at least 2 trustworthy narrators took from Malik al-Dar one may state that he is not Majhul in anyway as some claimed

This is a rejected rule by minority of scholars, so Abul Hassan is following rules of minority of scholars, and he admitted it to justify his creed, he follows rejected rules, accepted only by ibn Hibban, Ib Khuzaymah and few others. [/quote]

I say: What evidence does he have to say that al-Tahhan is a Hanafi? None as far as I know – for I have seen his work on Mustalah being pushed by some pseudo-Salafi's. On top of that, has Abu Alqama not seen spubs.com saying under the section of “Callers and Individuals” the following on al-Tahhan:

“One of the people who is ignorant of the affairs of Tawheed and Innovation, and confuses between what is Shirk and what is Innovation.”?!

Why is it that Abu Alqama takes reference to this late work by a contemporary then fails to bring any evidence for his claim that Malik's narration must be da'eef because the earlier Huffaz declared him to be majhûl or at least da'eef?!

Abu Alqama knows very well that Ibn Kathir – a student of ibn Taymiyya authenticated this narration in 2 works – and he must have believed that Malik is not majhûl but at least a saduq narrator. Indeed, both Ibn Kathir and ibn Hajar left works on Mustalah al-Hadith and knew the science of Hadith better than al-Tahhan or most of these pseudo-Salafiyya of this age.

I did suggest that at least two people took from Malik – and these two thiqa men were: Abu Salih al-Samman and Abdur Rahman ibn Sa'eed. On top of that the two sons of Malik: Awn and Abdullah took from him, but one needs to see if the latter have any tawthiq on them

Besides, Abu Alqama has indicated that even if 2 thiqa men take from Malik then this is still leading to Malik being majhûl al-haal, and no adala is established, as well as claiming that a minority of scholars accept what we are suggesting about the uplifting of the “un-knownness” of Malik. The fact is that no one from early times declared Malik to be majhûl al-Haal or majhûl al-Ain, let alone made any Jarh on him.

On the contrary there is strong indication that Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili knew who Malik was and they did not question his veracity as a transmitter of narrations. Their words are taken as proof that Malik is a sound narrator as we have shown above from practical examples using Ibn Hajar's *Tahdhib al-Tahdhib*.

What we surmised is based on the claims of Huffaz and not the minor contemporaries of this time. Abu Alqama stated that the likes of Ibn Hibban and Ibn Khuzayma accepted this principle we suggested and he considers it to be a minor position that is of no significance.

We have already shown that Ibn Hibban's tawthiq is not the only factor to show that Malik al-Dar has tawthiq on him. Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili's statements are crucial in bolstering the overall status of Malik al-Dar to be thiqa or saduq. This has already been demonstrated, and I have not seen how Abu Alqama can reject Ibn Sa'd's words: “Ka'na Ma'rufan” and al-Khalili saying: “Muttafaq alaihi” – by quoting from earlier Ulama that these are not valid expressions of Ta'dil!

Anyway, let us see what well-known Muhaddithin say about Majhul al-Ayn, Majhul al-Haal/Mastur.

Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Laknawi said the following in his well-recognised work on Mustalah al-hadith, known as *al-Raf' wa Takmil*:

248 ثم ان جهالة العين ترتفع برواية اثنين عنه دون جهالة الوصف هذا عند الاكثر وعند الدارقطني

جهالة الوصف ايضا ترتفع بها ومن ثم لم يقبل قول ابي حاتم في حق موسى بن هلال العبدي احد رواة

249 حديث من زار قبوري وجبت له شفاعتي انه مجهول لثبوت روايات الثقات عنه قال الخطيب

البغدادي في الكفاية المجهول عند اهل الحديث هو كل من لم يشتهر بطلب العلم في نفسه ولا عرفه العلماء

250 به ومن لم يعرف حديثه الا من جهة راو واحد مثل عمرو ذي مر وجبار الطائي وعبدالله بن اعز الهمداني وسعيد بن ذي حدان وهؤلاء كلهم لم يرو عنهم غير أي اسحاق السبيعي وروينا عن محمد بن يحيى الذهلي قال اذا روى عن المحدث رجلا ان ارتفع عنه اسم الجهالة انتهى وقال ايضا اقل ما ترتفع به الجهالة ان يروي عنه اثنان فصاعدا من ائمة مشهورين بالعلم الا انه لا يثبت له حكم العدالة بروايتهم عنه انتهى **وقال السخاوي في فتح المغيث قال الدارقطني من روى عنه ثقتان فقد ارتفعت جهالته وثبتت عدالته انتهى**

251 وقال ابن عبد البر في الاستذكار شرح الموطأ في باب ترك الوضوء مما مسته النار من روى عنه ثلاثة وقيل اثنان وليس بمجهول انتهى

وقال تقي الدين السبكي في شفاء السقام في زيارة خير الانام اما قول ابي حاتم الرازي فيه أي في موسى بن هلال انه مجهول فلا يضره فانه اما ان يريد به جهالة الوصف فان اراد جهالة العين وهو غالب اصطلاح اهل الشأن في هذا الاطلاق فذلك مرتفع عنه لانه روى عنه احمد بن حنبل ومحمد بن جابر المحاربي ومحمد بن اسماعيل الاحمسي وأبو امية محمد بن ابراهيم الطرسوسي وعبيد بن محمد الوراق والفضل بن سهل وجعفر بن محمد البزوري وبرواية ائمة تنفي جهالة العين فكيف برواية سبعة وان اراد جهالة الوصف فرواية احمد عنه ترفع من شأنه لا سيما مع ما قال ابن عدي فيه

253 وفي فتح المغيث على ان قول ابي حاتم في الرجل انه مجهول لا يريد به انه لم يروي عنه سوى واحد بدليل انه قال في داود ابن يزيد الثقفي انه مجهول مع انه قد روى عنه جماعة ولذا قال الذهبي عقبه هذا القول يوضح لك ان الرجل قد يكون مجهولا عند ابي حاتم ولو روى عنه جماعة ثقات يعني انه مجهول الحال انتهى

House of Verification

ايقاظ 14

في مدى قبول قول ابي حاتم في الراوي مجهول لا تغتر بقبول أبي حاتم في كثير من الرواة على ما يجده من يطالع الميزان وغيره انه مجهول ما لم يوافقه غيره من النقاد

255 احمد بن عاصم البلخي جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه ابن حبان وقال روى عنه اهل بلده ابراهيم بن عبد الرحمن المخزومي جهله ابن القطان وعرفه غيره فوثقه ابن حبان اسامة بن حفص المديني جهله أبو القاسم اللالكائي وقال الذهبي ليس بمجهول روى عنه اربعة

اسباط أبو اليسع جهله أبو حاتم وعرفه البخاري

بيان بن عمرو جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه ابن المديني وابن حبان وابن عدي وروى عنه البخاري وأبو زرعة وغبيد الله بن واصل

256 الحسين بن الحسن بن يسار جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه أحمد وغيره الحكم بن عبدالله البصري

جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه الذهلي وروى عنه اربع ثقات

عباس القنطري جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه أحمد وابنه

محمد بن الحكم المروزي جهله أبو حاتم ووثقه ابن حبان

ايقاظ 15

في بيان مدلول قول ابن القطان في الراوي لا يعرف له حال او لم تثبت عدالته

كثيرا ما تطلع في ميزان الاعتدال نقلا عن ابن القطان في حق

258 بعض الرواة لا يعرف له حال او لم تثبت عدالته والمراد به أبو الحسن علي بن محمد بن عبد الملك

الفاسي والمشهور بابن القطان المتوفى سنة ثمان وعشرين وست مئة مؤلف كتاب الوهم والايهام ، فلعلك

تظن منه ان ذلك الراوي مجهول أو غير ثقة وليس كذلك فان لابن القطان في اطلاق هذه الالفاظ اصطلاحا

لم يوافقه غيره فقد قال الذهبي في ميزانه في ترجمة حفص بن بغيل قال ابن القطان لا يعرف له حال

259 قلت : لم أذكر هذا النوع في كتابي هذا لان ابن القطان يتكلم في كل من لم يقل فيه امام عاصر

ذلك الرجل او اخذ عن عاصره ما يدل على عدالته وفي الصحيحين من هذا النمط كثيرون ما ضعفهم احد

ولا هم بمجاهيل. انتهى.

وقال ايضا في ترجمة مالك المصري : قال ابن القطان هو ممن لم تثبت عدالته. يريد انه ما نص على احد على

انه ثقة وفي رواية الصحيحين عدد كثير ما علمنا ان احدا وثقهم والجمهور على

260 ان من كان من المشايخ قد روى عنه جماعة ولم يأتي بما ينكر عليه ان حديثه صحيح. انتهى.

Shaykh al-Laknawi mentioned above the following useful points:

Hafiz al-Sakhawi the student of al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar mentioned from al-Daraqutni the following point in his *Fath al-Mugith* (Sharh on al-Iraqi's al-Alfiyya in Hadith):

Al-Daraqutni said: “One from whom two trustworthy narrators take Hadith, his state of “un-knownness” is lifted and his credibility is established.”

Also, Ibn Abdal Barr said similarly that if 2 or 3 narrate from an individual he is no longer majhûl, but he did not mention if the narrator's adala is established.

So how about Malik al-Dar – who had 4 people narrating from him?! See how al-Dhahabi also mentioned about Usama ibn Hafs al-Madini that he was not majhul – since he had 4 people narrating from him.

So those who lifted the condition of majhul from a narrator when 2 or more narrate from a Shaykh include al-Daraqutni and ibn Abdal Barr. There is Ikhtilaf on whether the one who is mastur/majhûl al-haal can have his narrations accepted and whether or not his adala is firmly established. This latter point is subject to clarification below.

Ibn al-Salah mentioned in his Muqaddima (p. 85-86)⁵:

في رواية الجھول وهو في غرضنا ههنا أقسام
أحدهما

الجهول العدالة من حيث الظاهر والباطن جميعا وروايته غير مقبولة عند الجماهير علي ما نبهنا
عليه أولا
الثاني

الجهول الذي جهلت عدالته الباطنة وهو عدل في الظاهر وهو المستور فقد قال بعض أئمتنا
المستور من يكون عدلا في الظاهر ولا تعرف عدالة باطنه فهذا الجھول يحتج بروايته بعض من رد
رواية الأول وهو قول بعض الشافعيين وبه قطع منهم الامام سليم بن أيوب الرازي قال لان أمر
الاخبار مبني علي حسن الظن بالراوي ولان رواية الاخبار تكون عند من يعتذر عليه معرفة العدالة
في الباطن فاقصر فيها علي معرفة ذلك في الظاهر وتفرق الشهادة فانها تكون عند الحكام ولا
يتعذر عليهم ذلك فاعتبر فيها العدالة في الظاهر والباطن قلت ويشبه ان يكون العمل علي هذا
الراي في كثير من كتب الحديث المشهورة في غير واحد من الرواة الذين تقادم العهد بهم وتعذرت
الخبرة الباطنة بهم والله اعلم

الثالث

الجهول العين وقد يقبل رواية الجھول العدالة من لا يقبل رواية الجھول العين ومن روي عنه

⁵ Dickinson and Fareed translation

عدلان وعيناه فقد ارتفعت عنه هذه الجهالة ذكر أبو بكر الخطيب البغدادي في أجوبة مسائل سئل عنها ان المجهول عند أصحاب الحديث هو كل من لم تعرفه العلماء ومن لم يعرف حديثه الا من جهة راو واحد مثل عمرو ذي مر وجبار الطائي وسعيد بن ذي حدان لم يرو عنهم غير أبي إسحاق السبيعي ومثل الهزهان بن ميزن لا راوي عنه غير الشعبي ومثل جري بن كليب لم يرو عنه الا قتادة قلت قد روي عن الهزهان الثوري أيضا قال الخطيب واقل ما ترتفع به الجهالة ان يروي عن الرجل اثنان من المشهورين بالعلم الا انه لا يثبت له حكم العدالة بروايتهما عنه وهذا مما قدمنا بيانه والله اعلم قلت قد خرج البخاري في صحيحه حديث جماعة ليس لهم غير راو واحد منهم مرداس الأسلمي لم يرو عنه قيس بن أبي حازم وكذلك خرج مسلم حديث قوم لا راوي لهم غير واحد منهم ربيعة بن كعب الأسلمي لم يرو عنه غير أبي سلمة بن عبد الرحمن وذلك منها مصير الي ان الراوي قد يخرج عن كونه مجهولا مردودا برواية واحد عنه والخلاف في ذلك متجه نحو اتجاه الخلاف المعروف في الاكتفاء بواحد في التعديل على ما قدمناه والله أعلم

8. Concerning the relation of an unknown transmitter (majhûl): for our present purposes, there are several types of unknown people:

a) The transmitter whose apparent integrity and real integrity are both unknown: in the view of the majority, his transmissions may not be accepted. This is in accordance with the opinion to which we earlier drew attention.

b) The unknown transmitter whose real integrity is unknown, although he is apparently upright and outwardly acceptable (mastur): one of our authorities has said: "The outwardly acceptable transmitter is someone who is apparently upright but whose real integrity is not known. **Some of those who reject the transmission of the first type of unknown person, adduce as proofs the transmission of this type. This is the doctrine of some of the Shafi'ites.** One of them who stated it plainly is the authority **Sulaym bin Ayyub al-Razi**:

'Because the question of reports is based on giving the transmitter the benefit of the doubt and because the transmission of reports is in the hands of those who are incapable of gaining knowledge of a transmitter's real integrity, limit yourself in regard to reports to knowledge of the transmitter's apparent integrity. Reports differ from testimony in court, for the latter is before the judges and they are not incapable of (discovering a witness's real integrity), so for testimony in court analyze a witness's apparent and real integrity.'

It seems that this view was acted upon in many of the famous books of hadith in regard to a number of transmitters who lived before the authors of the books and about whom it was impossible to obtain real first-hand knowledge. God knows best.

c) The transmitter whose identity is unknown⁶: Those who do not accept the relation of a transmitter whose identity is unknown *do sometimes accept the relation of a transmitter whose integrity is unknown*. Someone whom two upright narrators relate Hadith from and identify (that is, name) is not considered "unknown" in this sense.

In response to some questions he was asked, Abu Bakr al-Khatib al-Baghdadi said, 'In the view of the scholars of Hadith an unknown transmitter is everyone whom the scholars do not know and whose Hadith are only from the line of a single student. Examples are Amr Dhu Murr, Jabbar al-Ta'i and Sa'id bin Huddan, from whom only Abu Ishaq al-Sabi'i transmitted; al-Hazhaz bin Mayzan, from whom Sha'bi is the sole transmitter, and Jurayy bin Kulayb, from whom only Qatada transmitted.'

In reality Sufyan al-Thawri also transmitted from al-Hazhaz. Al-Khatib went on, "Infrequently it does happen that the label of 'unknown' is lifted from a transmitter by two scholars famous in Hadith transmitting from him. However, the verdict that he is upright is not established by their relation from him.' This is something which we explained above." (God knows best).

Bukhari included in his Sahih the hadith of a number of people from whom only one student related, including Mirdas al-Aslami, from whom only Qays bin Abi Hazim transmitted. Likewise, Muslim included the hadith of a number of people from whom only a single student transmitted, including Rabi'a bin Ka'b al-Aslami, from whom only Abu Salama bin Abdar Rahman transmitted. When Bukhari or Muslim includes the hadith of a transmitter, he may leave the state he was in of being unknown and rejected because only a single student related from him. The opposing view on that follows the previously cited line of argumentation known to have been made against the view that the statement of a single critic is enough to accredit a transmitter. God knows best."

Did Imam ibn al-Salah accept the riwâya of the one who is mastur if at least two well known narrators took from him?

⁶ Meaning Majhul al-Ain

Imam al-Qastallani said in his *Irshad al-Sari* (Sharh on Sahih al-Bukhari, 1/16):

و ترفع الجهالة عنه رواية اثنين مشهورين بالعلم و الصحابة كلهم عدول و قبل المستور قوم و
رجحه ابن الصلاح

This quote shows that Ibn al-Salah did accept the rule that the one who is masturb may have his narration accepted if two well known narrators take from him. This position seems similar in line with what al-Daraqutni said according to al-Sakhawi's quote.

Imam al-Nawawi accepted the utilisation of the narrations of one who is masturb in his *al-Majmu Sharh al-Muhadhdhab* (9/34):

(الشَّرْحُ) حَدِيثُ { مَنْ أَعَانَ عَلَى قَتْلِ مُسْلِمٍ بِشَطْرِ كَلِمَةٍ } رَوَاهُ وَأَمَّا حَدِيثُ أُمِّ سَلَمَةَ فَرَوَاهُ أَبُو
يَعْلَى الْمُؤَصِّلِيُّ فِي مُسْنَدِهِ بِإِسْنَادٍ صَحِيحٍ إِلَّا رَجُلًا وَاحِدًا فَإِنَّهُ مُسْتَوْرٌ , وَالْأَصَحُّ جَوَازُ الْاِحْتِجَاجِ
بِرَوَايَةِ الْمُسْتَوْرِ

This type of acceptance of narrations related by those who are majhûl al-haal is also accepted by most of the Hanafi Ulama. Indeed, Imam al-Zarkashi in his follow up points on Ibn al-Salah's above mentioned *al-Muqaddima*, known as *Nuqat ala Ibn al Salah* (3/375) quoted al-Hafiz Abu Abdullah ibn al-Mawwaq affirming that the Ahnaf accept the narrations of those who are majhûl narrators (see below for Imam Ali al-Qari's analysis).

Secondly, he claimed that the majority of the people of Hadith (akhthar ahlul hadith ila qabul riwayatihum wal ihtijaj biha) accepted the narrations of one who is Majhul al-Haal, and he named al-Daraqutni and al-Bazzar from them. Ibn al-Mawwaq said:

والثاني اختلف فيهم أهل الحديث و الفقهاء فذهب أكثر أهل الحديث الى قبول رواياتهم
والاحتجاج بها منهم البزار و الدارقطني فنص البزار في كتاب الأشربة له و في فوائده في غير
موضع على أن روى عنه ثقتان فقد ارتفعت جهالته و نحو ذلك الدارقطني في الديات من سننه

This appears to be slightly at odds with what al-Hafiz ibn Hajar mentioned in his *Nuzhat al-Nazr* (Sharh on Nukhbatul Fikr), where he said:

وإن روى ⁽⁷⁾ [عنه] ⁽⁸⁾ اثنان فصاعداً ولم يُوثَّق ؛ فـ [هو] ⁽⁹⁾ مجهول الحال ، وهو المستور ، وقد قبل روايته جماعةً بغير قيد ، وردّها { ص / 14 ب } الجمهور .
 والتّحقيق أنّ رواية المستور ونحوه ممّا فيه الاحتمال لا يُطلق [القول] ⁽¹⁰⁾ [⁽¹¹⁾] برّدّها ولا بقبولها ، بل « يقال » ⁽¹²⁾ هي موقوفة إلى استبانة حاله كما جزم به إمام الحرمين .

This quote mentions that a group accepted the narration of the mastur without restriction though the majority rejected it. These quotes from al-Zarkashi and ibn Hajar shows that there is no absolute agreement if the narration of one who is majhûl al-haal is totally rejected or absolutely accepted in all cases. One needs to see the practical reality of how some of the Huffaz and Fuqaha applied the rules of accepting the narrations of those who are majhûl al-haal on an individual basis, as well as an analysis of specific chains of transmission.

Ibn Hajar's student: Hafiz al-Sakhawi mentioned the following in his *Fath al-Mugith*¹³ (where he also commented on the last point from his Shaykh):

والحال فقط كمن روى عنه اثنان فصاعداً، ولم يوثق فأما جهالة التعيين فخارجة عن هذا كله، كأن يقول: أخبرني فلان، أو فلان، ويسميها، وهما عدلان فالحجة قائمة بذلك، فإن جهلت عدالة أحدهما مع التصريح باسمه أو إمامه فلا (والقسم الوسط) أي الثاني (مجهول حال باطن) وحال (ظاهر) من العدالة وضدها مع عرفان عينه برواته عدلين عنه، (وحكمه الرد) وعدم القبول (لدى) أي عند (الجماهير) من الأئمة كما قال ابن الصلاح، وعزاه ابن المواق للمحققين، ومنهم أبو حاتم الرازي، وما حكيناه من صنيعه فيما تقدم يشهد له.

وكذا قال الخطيب: لا يثبت للراوي حكم العدالة برواية الاثنين عنه.

وقال ابن رشيد لا فرق في جهالة الحال بين رواية واحد واثنين ما لم يصرح الواحد أو غيره بعدالته، نعم كثرة رواية الثقات عن الشخص تقوي حسن الظن فيه.

(في « ط » : أن يروي .⁷)

(ليست في « ن » .⁸)

(ليست في « ب » .⁹)

(في « ظ » : القبول .¹⁰)

(ليست في « ص » .¹¹)

(زيادة من « ط » و « ظ » و « ص » و « ب » .¹²)

¹³ Vol. 1/230-231

وأما المجاهيل الذين لم يرو عنهم إلا الضعفاء، فهم متروكون، كما [ص 322] قال ابن حبان على الأحوال كلها.

وتوجيه هذا القول أن مجرد الرواية عن الراوي، لا تكون تعديلاً له على الصحيح كما تقدم، وقيل تقبل مطلقاً وهو لازم من جعل مجرد رواية العدل عن الراوي تعديلاً له كما تقدم مثله في القسم الأول، وأولى بل نسبه ابن المواق لأكثر أهل الحديث كالبنزار والدارقطني. وعبارة الدارقطني: من روى عنه ثقتان، فقد ارتفعت جهالته، وثبتت عدالته، وقال أيضاً في الديات نحوه، وكذا اكتفى بمجرد روايتهما ابن حبان، بل توسع كما تقدم في مجهول العين، وقيل بفصل: فإن كان لا يرويان إلا عن عدل قبل وإلا فلا (و) القسم (الثالث المجهول للعدالة) أي مجهول العدالة (في باطن فقط) مع كونه عدلاً في الظاهر (فـ) هذا (قد رأى له حجية) أي احتجاجاً به في الحكم (بعض من منع) من الشافعية (ما قبله) من القسمين (منهم) الفقيه (سليم) بضم أوله مصغراً ابن أيوب الرازي وزاد (فقط) أي جزم (به) لأن الأخبار تبني على أحسن الظن بالراوي، وأيضاً فلتعسر الخبرة الباطنية على الناقد. ولهذا فارق الراوي الشاهد، فإن الشهادة تكون عند الحكام، وهم لا تتعسر عليهم لاسيما مع اجتهد الأخصام في الفحص عنها، بل عزى الاحتجاج بأهل هذا القسم كالقسم الأول لكثيرين من المحققين قاله النووي في مقدمة شرح مسلم.

قلت: ومنهم أبو بكر بن فورك، وكذا قبله أبو حنيفة خلافاً للشافعي، ومن عزاه إليه فقد وهم (وقال الشيخ) ابن الصلاح (إن العملا يشبه أنه على ذا) القول الذي قطع به سليم (جعلاً في كتب من الحديث اشتهرت) وتداولها الأئمة فمن دونهم حيث خرج فيها لرواة (خبرة بعض من) خرج له منهم (بها) أي بالكتب لتقدم العهد بهم (تعذرت في باطن الأمر) فاقصر وفي البعض على [ص 323] العدالة ظاهرة، وفيه نظر بالنسبة للصحيحين فإن جهالة الحال مندفة عن جميع من خرج له في الأصول، بحيث لا نجد أحداً ممن خرج له، كذلك يسوغ إطلاق اسم الجهالة عليه أصلاً، كما حققه شيخنا في مقدمته، وأما بالنظر لمن عداهما لاسيما من لم يشترط الصحيح، فما قاله ممكن، وكان الحامل لهم على هذا المسلك غلبة العدالة على الناس في تلك القرون الفاضلة. ولذا قال بعض الحنفية: المستورد في زماننا لا يقبل لكثرة الفساد، وقلة الرشاد، وإنما كان مقبولا في زمن السلف الصالح، هذا مع احتمال اطلاعهم على ما لم نطلع نحن عليه من أمرهم (وبعض من الأئمة وهو البغوي في تهذيبه (يشتهر) بفتح أوله، وثالثه يعني يسمى (ذا القسم مستورا) وتبعه عليه الرافعي، ثم النووي فقال في النكاح من الروضة: إن المستور من عرفت عدالته ظاهراً لا باطناً، وقال إمام الحرمين: المستور من لم يظهر منه نقيض العدالة، ولم ينفق البحث في الباطن عن عدالته.

قال: وقد تردد المحدثون في قبول روايته، والذي صار إليه المعتبرون من الأصوليين أنها لا تقبل، قال وهو المقطوع به عندنا. وصحح النووي في شرح المذهب القبول، وحكى الرافعي في الصوم وجهين من غير ترجيح.

قيل: والخلاف مبني على شرط قبول الرواية، أهو العلم بالعدالة، أو عدم العلم بالمفسق؟ إن قلنا بالأول لم تقبل المستور وإلا قبلناه.

وأما شيخنا فإنه بعد أن قال: وإن روى عنه اثنان فصاعداً ولم يوثق فهو مجهول الحال وهو المستور. وقد قبل روايته جماعة بغير قيد يعني بعصر دون آخر، وردّها الجمهور قال: والتحقيق أن رواية المستور ونحوه مما فيه الاحتمال لا يطلق القول بردها ولا بقبولها، بل يقال هي موقوفة إلى استبانة حاله كما جزم به إمام [ص 324] الحرمين يعني صريحاً، ورأى أنا إذا كنا نعتقد على شيء يعني مما لا دليل فيه بخصوصه، بل انجری على الإباحة الأصلية، فروى لنا مستور تحريمه إنه يجب الإنكفاف عما كنا نستحلّه إلى تمام البحث عن حال الراوي.

وقال: وهذا هو المعروف من عادتكم وشيئهم، وليس ذلك حكماً منهم بالخطر المرتب على الرواية، وإنما هو توقف في الأمر، فالتوقف عن الإباحة يتضمن الانحجاز، وهو في معنى الخطر وذلك مأخوذ من قاعدة في الشريعة ممهدة، وهي التوقف عند بدء وظهور الأمور إلى استبانتها، فإذا ثبتت العدالة فالحكم بالرواية إذ ذاك، ولو فرض فإرض التباس حال الراوي واليأس عن البحث عنها بأن يروي مجهول، ثم يدخل في غمار الناس، ويعتز العثور عليه، فهذه مسألة اجتهادية عندي.

والظاهر أن الأمر إذا انتهى إلى اليأس لم يجب الإنكفاف وانقلبت الإباحة كراهية. قال شيخنا: ونحوه القول فالتوقف قول ابن الصلاح فيمن جرح بجرح غير مفسر انتهى.

House of Verification

The Hanafi Imam of his time, Mulla Ali al-Qari (d. 1014 AH) in his Sharh on al-Hafiz ibn Hajar's above work (Nuzhat al-Nazr), known as Sharh Sharh Nukhbatul Fikr (p. 154) mentioned:

وقد قبل رواية المستور جماعة، منهم أبو حنيفة رضي الله عنه، بغير قيد، يعني بعصر دون عصر، ذكره السخاوي. واختار هذا القول ابن حبان تبعاً للإمام الأعظم، إذ العدل عنده من لا يعرف فيه الجرح، قال - أي ابن حبان - : والناس في أحوالهم على اللّاح و العدالة حتى يتبين منهم ما يوجب القدح، و لم يكلف الناس ما غاب عنهم، و إنما كلفوا الحكم بالظاهر.

و قيل انما قبله أبو حنيفة رحمه الله في صدر السلام, حيث كان الغالب على الناس العدالة, فأما اليوم فلا بد من التزكية لغلبة الفسق, و به قال صاحباؤه أبو يوسف و محمد.
و حاصل الخلاف – بين أبي حنيفة و صاحبيه – أن المستور من الصحابة, و التابعين, و أتباعهم :
يقبل, بشهادة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لهم, بقوله – خبر القرون قري, ثم الذين يلونهم ثم
الذين يلونهم, – و غيرهم لا يقبل الا بتوثيق, وهو تفصيل حسن

The last quote mentioned that a group, including Imam Abu Hanifa accept the riwâya of the masturb without restriction, more so if it linked to narrators form the Salaf al-Salihin.

Having mentioned above that there is no agreement on utilising all narrators who are majhûl al-haal, the converse can also be shown – that some Shafi'i Ulama and the great ones like Imam Abu Hanifa do accept their narrations. So how can the likes of Abu Alqama brag in their claim above:

“This is a rejected rule by minority of scholars, so Abul Hassan is following rules of minority of scholars, and he admitted it to justify his creed, he follows rejected rules, accepted only by ibn Hibban, Ib Khuzaymah and few others.”

?!

One may ask his likes – were the likes of Ibn Kathir and Ibn Hajar also those who authenticated the Malik al-Dar narration to justify their creed O Abu Alqama? Who said there is Ijma that it is a minority rule to accept the narration of one who is majhûl al-haal?! Who said there is Ijma that it is a rejected rule? Clearly there is Ikhtilaf on this issue and some flexibility has been seen.

Hence, with Malik al-Dar, what is known is that some 4 students took from him and with the utilisation of the appraisal (tawthiq) of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Hibban and al-Khalili his adala as a trustworthy narrator is also established Insha'allah.

If someone was to state that Malik al-Dar is still Majhul al-Haal and his narrations are not utilisable from that perspective alone, we may say let us look at the practical realities of those who accepted the narrations of one who is Majhul al-Haal on specific occasions when only ibn Hibban made tawthiq on a narrator.

**Demonstrating the fact that al-Hafiz ibn Hajar
declared some narrators to be saduq or thiqa when
only Ibn Hibban made tawthiq
On that specific narrator**

Examples:

- i) Under the narrator known as Ishaq ibn Ibrahim ibn Nasr al-Bukhari, al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar mentioned the following in his Tahdhib (vol. 1):

[409] خ البخاري إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن نصر البخاري أبو إبراهيم المعروف بالسعدي روى عن أبي أسامة وعبد الرزاق وغيرهم وعنه البخاري وربما نسبته إلى جده قال أبو القاسم اللالكائي توفي يوم الجمعة غرة شهر ربيع الآخر سنة 242 قلت ذكره بن حبان في الثقات وقال كان قديم الموت وبخط الذهبي أنه يقال له أيضا السعدي بضم ثم معجمة

This narrator was listed in ibn Hibban's Thiqat only. On top of that, only al-Bukhari narrated from him.

Imam al-Bukhari listed him in his Ta'rikh al-Kabir (vol. 1) as follows:

[1212] إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن نصر أبو إبراهيم سمع أبا أسامة

It is clear from the above quote that al-Bukhari made no jarh or explicit Ta'dil on Ishaq ibn Ibrahim but still he narrated from him in his Sahih numerous times.

This brings us on to the point that some Ulama have mentioned that if Imam al-Bukhari made no Jarh or Ta'dil on specific narrators in his Ta'rikh, then this silence on his part is an indication that such a narrator is carried forward in the utilisation of his narrations. Hence, this is held to be a form

of Tawthiq.

Indeed, Imam al-Mizzi mentioned the following in his *Tabdhib al-Kamal* (18/265, Awwad edn) from al-Hafiz Abu Muhammad al-Ishbili (d. 522 AH) who quoted from the Ta'rikh of al-Bukhari that he had in his possession:

قال الحافظ أبو محمد عبد الله بن أحمد بن سعيد بن يربوع الاشبيلي: بين مسلم جرحه في صدر كتابه، وأما البخاري، فلم ينبه من أمره على شيء فدل أنه عنده على الاحتمال، لانه قد قال في التاريخ: كل من لم أبن فيه جرحه فهو على الاحتمال، وإذا قلت: فيه نظر، فلا يحتمل.

NOTE – If the above quote from al-Ishbili is sound then this shows that generally if al-Bukhari remained silent on a narrator by not making any form of Jarh, then his narrations are carried forward and tawthiq is admissible. If this be the case then this can be extended to what al-Bukhari mentioned about Malik al-Dar in his Ta'rikh al-Kabir (vol. 7) as follows:

[1295] مالك بن عياض الدار أن عمر قال في قحط يا رب لا آلو إلا ما عجزت عنه قاله علي عن محمد بن خازم عن أبي صالح عن مالك الدار

Here, al-Bukhari made no Jarh or explicit Ta'dil on Malik al-Dar, and if one accepts the quote ascribed to the Ta'rikh in the possession of al-Ishbili, then this indicates that Imam al-Bukhari would have permitted Malik al-Dar's narrations to be utilised. Also, the above quote from al-Bukhari shows that al-Bukhari knew of Malik's narration under discussion though he mentioned an abridged version of it. This does not mean that al-Bukhari thought the narration to be da'eef or that it has an inconsistent matn (mudtarib).

Technically this narrator (Ishaq ibn Ibrahim) is Majhul al-Ain but his narrations were acceptable to al-Bukhari, and so Ibn Hajar declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 333). While Shaykh Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut and Dr Bashhar Awwad Ma'ruf claimed that Ishaq is Thiqa in their *Tahrir al-Taqrīb* (no. 333)

- ii) Under Iyyas ibn al-Harith al-Dawsi Hijazi, Ibn Hajar mentioned in his *Tabdhib* (vol. 1):

[712] د س أبي داود والنسائي إياس بن الحارث بن معيقب بن أبي فاطمة الدوسي حجازي روى عن جده معيقب وعن جده لأمه بن أبي ذباب روى عنه أبو مكين نوح بن ربيعة له عندهما حديث واحد في ذكر الخاتم قلت وذكره بن حبان في الثقات

Only Ibn Hibban listed him in al-Thiqat and just one student took from Iyyas, hence being majhûl al-Ain. Ibn Hajar declared him Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 584)

- iii) Under Iyyas ibn Khalifa al-Bakri Hijazi, Ibn Hajar mentioned in his *Tahdhib* (vol. 1):

[714] س النسائي إياس بن خليفة البكري حجازي روى عن رافع بن خديج وعنه عطاء بن أبي رباح روى له النسائي حديثا واحدا في الطهارة قلت وذكره بن حبان في الثقات وقال العقيلي في حديثه وهم ذكر بن سعد في الطبقة الثانية من التابعين من أهل مكة وقال كان قليل الحديث

Here Ibn Hibban listed him in his *Thiqat*, al-Uqayli said he had mistakes in his Hadith, Ibn Sa'd listed him in the second grade of the *Tabi'in* in Makka and he had few hadiths. Ibn Hajar declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 585)

- iv) Under Ayyub ibn Ibrahim al-Thaqafi, Ibn Hajar mentioned in his *Tahdhib* (vol. 1):

[728] صد أبي داود في فضائل الأنصار أيوب بن إبراهيم الثقفي أبو يحيى المروزي لقبه عبدويه وهو جد أبي يحيى محمد بن يحيى القصري روى عن إبراهيم بن ميمون الصائغ وعنه بن أخيه هاشم بن مخلد وذكره بن حبان في الثقات وقال يروي عن إبراهيم الصائغ بنسخة روى له النسائي في الخصائص حديثا واحدا

Here, only one student took from Ayyub and only Ibn Hibban listed him in *al-Thiqat*, but still Ibn Hajar declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 600)

- v) Under Ayyub ibn Bashir al-Ijli al-Shami, Ibn Hajar in his *Tahdhib* (vol. 1) mentioned:

[731] فق بن ماجه في التفسير أيوب بن بشير العجلي الشامي روى عن شفى بن ماع وعنه ثعلبة بن مسلم الخثعمي قلت وذكره بن حبان في الثقات وذكره الذهبي في الميزان وقال مجهول

Here only one person took from Ayyub, Ibn Hibban listed him in al-Thiqat while al-Dhahabi said he was majhûl in al-Mizan, but still, Ibn Hajar declared him Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 603)

vi) Under Bishr ibn Qurra, Ibn Hajar mentioned in *al-Tahdhib* (vol. 1)

[838] د أبي داود بشر بن قره وقيل قره بن بشر عن أبي بردة عن أبيه في طلب العمل وعنه إسماعيل بن أبي خالد أو عن أخيه عنه قلت ذكره بن حبان في الثقات في بشر وحكى البخاري في التاريخ فيه الوجهين عن إسماعيل بن أبي خالد وقال بن القطان مجهول الحال

Here, Ibn Hibban listed him in al-Thiqat while Ibn al Qattan declared him Majhul al-Haal, but still, Ibn Hajar declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 699)

vii) Under Khalifa ibn Saa'id al-Ashja'i ibn Hajar mentioned the following in *al-Tahdhib* (vol. 3)

[306] مد أبي داود في المراسيل خليفة بن صاعد الأشجعي مولا هم الكوفي روى عن بن عمر وابن الزبير وأسماء بنت أبي بكر وعنه ابنه خلف ذكره بن حبان في الثقات

Khalifa took from three Sahaba while only Khalf took from him. Ibn Hibban listed him in al-Thiqat alone. Despite being majhûl al-ain, Ibn Hajar still declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 1745).

viii) Under Rifa'a ibn Rafi al-Ansari, Ibn Hajar said in *al-Tahdhib* (vol. 3):

[529] خ د ت س البخاري وأبو داود والترمذي والنسائي رفاعه بن رافع بن خديج الأنصاري الحارثي المدني روى عن أبيه حديث انا لاقوا العدو غدا وعن ابنه عباية قال أبو الأحوص عن سعيد بن مسروق عنه عن

أبيه وقال الثوري وشعبة وغير واحد عن سعيد بن مسروق عن عباية عن جده وهو المحفوظ قلت وذكره ابن حبان في الثقات وقال يكنى أبا خديج مات في ولاية الوليد بن عبد الملك

Al-Bukhari and others recorded his narration and Ibn Hibban listed him in al-Thiqat, while Ibn Hajar declared him Thiqat in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 1946)

The question for Abu Alqama is does he accept the technically majhûl narrators found in Sahih al-Bukhari or not? If he does then on what basis?!

Finally,

- ix) Under Ziyad ibn Sayfi ibn Suhaib, Ibn Hajar said in *al-Taqrīb* (vol. 3)

[682] ق بن ماجه زياد بن صيفي بن صهيب بن سنان ويقال يزيد بن صيفي روى عن جده صهيب وأبيه صيفي وعنه ابنه عبد الحميد بن زكريا ذكر بن حبان في الثقات له عند بن ماجه حديث في التشديد في الدين قلت وذكره البخاري في تاريخه وابن أبي حاتم ولم يذكر فيه جرحا

Here, only one narrator took from him, Ibn Hibban listed him in *al-Thiqat*, and no Jarh was recorded against him by Ibn Abi Hatim or al-Bukhari. Ibn Hajar declared him to be Saduq in *al-Taqrīb* (no. 2084).

Note – Some Ulama have also made the claim that if Ibn Abi Hatim al-Razi mentioned no Jarh or Ta'dil explicitly in his book of narrators then these narrators may be carried forward. This rule was not accepted by Abul Hasan Ibn al-Qattan from earlier times, and pseudo-Salafi contemporaries like al-Albani, Hammad al-Ansari and their likes in general.

These examples are all to do with technically majhûl narrators but still they were accepted for their probity as narrators by the Amir al-Mu'minin of Hadith, the Hafiz al-Waqt bila Shak – Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani.

If this is the way Ibn Hajar dealt with some majhûl narrators then what is stopping us from declaring Malik al-Dar to be at least Saduq if not Thiqat?! Especially since Malik al-Dar has tawthiq on him from Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili.

Al-Albani and his authentication of some chains containing the technically majhûl narrators

Once again, let us look at how Abu Alqama's own Muhaddith al-Asr, al-Albani accepted an isnâd to be Jayyid (good) where a narrator known as Abu Sa'eed al-Ghifari who was declared -

- i) Thiqa by Ibn Hibban
- ii) Was a Tabi'i
- iii) Had no Jarh or Ta'dil mentioned about him by Ibn Abi Hatim and had two students narrate from him (Abu Hani al-Khawlani and Khallad ibn Sulayman)

قال الألباني في "السلسلة الصحيحة" 2 / 296 :

أخرجه الحاكم (4 / 168) من طريق أبي هانيء حميد بن هانيء الخولاني حدثني أبو سعيد الغفاري أنه قال : سمعت أبا هريرة رضي الله عنه يقول : سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول : فذكره . وقال : " صحيح الإسناد " . و وافقه الذهبي . قلت : و رجاله ثقات رجال مسلم غير أبي سعيد هذا , أورده الحافظ في " التعجيل " عن الهيثمي , و قال : " ذكره ابن حبان في " الثقات " . فأفاد الحافظ " أنه في نسخة " الثقات " بخط الحافظ أبي علي البكري (أبو سعد) بسكون العين و قال : مولى بني غفار . و كذا هو في " الكنى " لأبي أحمد . ثم وجدته في " تاريخ ابن يونس " فقال : مولى بني غفار . روى عنه أبو هانيء و خلاد بن سليمان الحضرمي , فأفاد عنه راويا آخر " .

قلت : و كذلك أورده ابن أبي حاتم في " الجرح و التعديل " (4 / 379 / 1) و لم يذكر فيه جرحا و لا تعديلا . و شذ الدولابي فأورده في فصل المعروفين بالكنى من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من كتبه " الكنى " (1 / 33) فقال : " و أبو سعيد الغفاري " . و لم يزد ! و قال ابن أبي حاتم في " العلل " (2 / 340) : " سألت أبي عن حديث ... ابن وهب عن أبي هانيء حميد بن هانيء الخولاني

عن أبي سعيد الغفاري ... (فذكره) فقال أبي : إنما هو أبو سعيد الغفاري . ثم ذكرته لعلي بن الحسين بن الجنيد قال : حدثنا أحمد بن صالح عن ابن وهب , فقال : أبو سعيد الغفاري " .

قلت : كذا في المواضع الثلاثة " سعيد " , و لا يستقيم المعنى به , ففعل الصواب في الآخرين منها " سعد " . و الله أعلم .

و قال المناوي في " الفيض " : " و رواه أيضا الطبراني . قال الهيثمي : و فيه

أبو سعيد الغفاري , لم يرو عنه غير حميد بن هانيء , و رجاله وثقوا , و رواه عنه

ابن أبي الدنيا في " ذم الحسد " قال الحافظ العراقي : و سنده جيد " .

قلت : قد روى عنه **خلاد بن سليمان** أيضا كما تقدم , فقد ارتفعت عنه جهالة العين ,

ثم هو تابعي , فمثله يحسن حديثه جماعة من الحفاظ , فلا جرم جود إسناده الحافظ

العراقي , و هو الذي انشرح له صدري , و اطمأنت إليه نفسي , فالحديث علم من

أعلام نبوته صلى الله عليه و على آله وسلم .

Al-Albani mentioned that this transmitter's narration was declared good by a number of Huffaz, including Hafiz al-Iraqi. This example from al-Albani shows that on occasions he accepted tawthiq on a narrator who was Majhul al-Haal with just the tawthiq of ibn Hibban alone!

More examples from al-Albani:

In his *Silsila al-Sahiba* (2/392) he said:

أخرجه تمام في " الفوائد " (2 / 20) و الخطيب في " تاريخ بغداد " (13 / 95)

من طريق زكريا بن يحيى الواسطي - رحمه - حدثنا **بشر بن عبد الله بن عمر بن**

عبد

العزیز أخبرني عبد العزيز بن عمر عن نافع عن ابن عمر قال : فذكره مرفوعا .

قلت : و هذا **إسناد حسن** رجاله ثقات غير **بشر بن عبد الله هذا** , ترجمه ابن أبي

حاتم (1 / 1 / 361) و لم يذكر فيه جرحا و لا تعديلا , لكن يروي عنه جماعة من

الثقات , و هو على شرط ابن حبان , فلعلة في كتابه " الثقات " .

و عبد العزيز بن عمر , مع كونه من رجال الشيخين فقد تكلم فيه , فأورده الذهبي

في " الضعفاء " و قال : " ثقة , ضعفه أبو مسهر " . و قال الحافظ في " التقريب " :
" صدوق يخطئ " . و الحديث عزاه السيوطي في " الجامع " للخطيب وحده فقصر !

So how is it O Abu Alqama that once again we see your Shaykh declaring a sanad to be Hasan where we have a narrator known as Bishr ibn Abdullah who:

- i) Has been declared Thiqat only by Ibn Hibban, but –
- ii) Has no Jarh or Ta'dil recorded on him by Ibn Abi Hatim

?!

Al-Albani said that a group of Thiqat took from Bishr and this is on the shart of ibn Hibban, even so, al-Albani still went ahead and declared the sanad to be Hasan!

This is what is in Ibn Abi Hatim's al-Jarh wa Ta'dil:

– بشر بن عبد الله بن عمر بن عبد العزيز أبو سلمة روى عنه اسماعيل ابن عياش ويحيى بن يحيى
ومعلى بن منصور الرازي سمعت ابي يقول ذلك. قال أبو محمد وروى عنه نعيم بن ميسرة]
النحوي – 3 [الرازي

The above mentions that 4 students narrated from Bishr:

- a) Isma'il ibn Ayyash
- b) Yahya ibn Yayha
- c) Ma'la ibn Mansur al-Razi
- d) Nu'aym ibn Maysara al-Razi

While ibn Hibban said in his al-Thiqat:

[12626] بشر بن عبد الله بن عمر بن عبد العزيز بن مروان بن الحكم القرشي الأموي كنيته أبو سلمة
يروى عن أبيه وعمه عبد العزيز بن عمر بن عبد العزيز روى عنه أبو بدر شجاع بن الوليد وزكريا بن يحيى
زحمويه

Here, Ibn Hibban mentioned two more students who took from Bishr:

- a) Abu Badr Shuja ibn al Walid
- b) Zakariyya ibn Yahya Zahmawaih

Hence, six students took from Bishr and Ibn Abi Hatim explicitly mentioned no Jarh or Ta'dil, except that Ibn Hibban listed Bishr in his book of Thiqat.

Al-Albani said in his *Irwa al-Ghalil* (1/242):

225 - (قال الحسن العبدى : رأيت أبا زيد صاحب رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) يؤذن قاعدا وكانت رجله أصيبت في سبيل الله رواه الأثرم) . ص 65 .
ورواه البيهقي (1 / 392) من طريق عثمان بن عمر ثنا اسماعيل بن مسلم عن **الحسن بن محمد** قال : دخلت على ابي زيد الأنصاري فأذن وأقام وهو جالس . قال : وتقدم رجل فصلى بنا - وكان أعرج أصيب رجله في سبيل الله تعالى . قلت : **وهذا إسناد حسن** إن شاء الله تعالى - رجاله كلهم ثقات معروفون **غير الحسن بن محمد هذا وهو العبدى** كما في رواية الأثرم وقد **أورده ابن أبي حاتم في " الجرح والتعديل " (1 / 2 / 35)** فقال : " روى عن أبي زيد الأنصاري ، روى عنه علي بن المبارك الهنائي " . قلت : فقد روى عنه اسماعيل بن مسلم ايضا كما ترى وهو العبدى القاضي وبذلك ارتفعت جهالة عينه ، **وقد ذكره ابن حبان في " الثقات " (1 / 15) ثم هو تابعي** وقد روى امرأ شاهده فالنفس تطمئن إلى مثل هذه الرواية . والله أعلم .

Here, al-Albani declared a sanad to be Hasan based on the chain containing trustworthy narrators with the exception of al-Hasan ibn Muhammad al-Abdi who was:

- i) A Tabi'i
- ii) Declared thiqa by Ibn Hibban alone
- iii) Mentioned in ibn Abi Hatim's al-Jarh wa Ta'dil where he said that Ali ibn al-Mubarak narrated from al-Hasan, while al-Albani said that Isma'il ibn Muslim also narrated from al-Hasan, thus lifting the state of being majhûl al-ain for al-Hasan

How is it that with the tawthiq of just Ibn Hibban, al-Albani still declared the sanad to be Hasan O Abu Alqama?!

Imam al-Dhahabi mentioned in his early work known as *Kitab al-Uluw* the following narration:

قال محمد بن يحيى الذهلي أخبرني **صالح بن الضريس** قال جعل عبد الله يضرب رأس قرابة له يرى برأي جهم فرأيته يضرب بالنعل على رأسه ويقول لا حتى تقول الرحمن على العرش استوى بائن من خلقه

Al-Albani in his editing of the abridged version of this work known as *Mukhtasar al-Uluw* (p. 173, note 170) said the following to this last narration:

قلت: ذكره المصنف من رواية محمد بن يحيى الذهلي : أخبرني صالح بن الضريس. و هذا سند لا بأس به, فان صالحا هذا أورده ابن أبي حاتم (406/1/2) -
(407)

و قال: روى عنه **محمد بن أيوب**. و لم يذكر فيه جرحا و لا تعديلا. وقد روى عنه الذهلي أيضا كما في هذا الأثر.

Here, al-Albani declared the sanad to have no harm with it and he based this claim on mentioning that the narrator Salih bin al-Durays had no Jarh or Ta'dil on him according to ibn Abi Hatim. Additionally Salih is majhûl al-haal since al-Albani mentioned that only al-Dhuhli and Muhammad ibn Ayyub narrated from Salih.

Ya Abu Alqama!

Why is it that al-Albani used to reject and weaken some Asanid with those who were Majhul al-Haal and only listed in *Kitab al-Thiqat* of ibn Hibban, but at other times he accepted their narrations and declared their Isnads to be Hasan and so on?! How about the last example where no one made a single remark of tawthiq on Salih, but still al-Albani declared the sanad to have no problem with it; hence indicating a level of authenticity?!

So how do the likes of Abu Alqama and for that matter, al-Albani stand now with Malik al-Dar who was also listed by Ibn Hibban and had 4 students narrating form him, with the fact that Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili knew only of Ta'dil for Malik?

May be the following from the Shaykh al-Hadith of the Deobandi's in his time will show what some contemporary Ahnaf think of majhûl narrators.

On page 78 of the English translation by White thread Press of the book "The Differences of the Imams", Shaykh Muhammad Zakariyya Kandhalawi said:

"If the narrator of any hadith is unknown in the field of hadith, but the other narrators who are narrating from him are reliable, then he will also be considered as a known narrator and his narration will be accepted...."

These quotes show that there is khilaf on this issue but what it demonstrates is that although there is no absolute agreement that if two trustworthy narrators take from a narrator he automatically has his adala established as al-Daraqutni held (based on al-Sakhawi's quote in Fath al-Mugith), but it does lift his state from being an absolute majhûl to others from another perspective as Khatib al-Baghdadi mentioned. Besides, there are at least 4 people who took from Malik al-Dar.

On top of this, no one is known to have weakened Malik al-Dar, so Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda in his marginalia to Imam al-Laknawi's *al-Raf wa Takmil* (p. 232-248) mentioned that the following earlier and contemporary authors accept the narration of someone who has not been explicitly weakened or listed in the books of weak and rejected narrators (al-Du'afa wal Matrukin):

Al-Haythami
Ibn Daqiq al-'Id
Al-Mundhiri
Al-Zayla'i
Majd al-Din Ibn Taymiyya (the grandfather)
Al-Dhahabi
Ibn 'Abd al-Hadi
Ibn al-Qayyim
Ibn Kathir
al-Zarkashi
Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalani,
Al-Sakhawi
Al-Shawkani

Among contemporaries who have all passed away (with the exception of Shaykh Taqi) we have:

Ahmad Shakir (“Salafi”)
Zafar Ahmad al-Thanawi
Habib al-Rahman al-A’zami
Muhammad `Abd al-Rashid al-Nu’mani
Muhammad Taqi al-`Uthmani
Isma`il al-Ansari (“Salafi” who opposed al-Albani),
and Abd Allah ibn al-Siddiq al-Ghumari.

May be Abu Alqama will oppose all of these authors by quoting the likes of al-Mu’allimi, al-Albani or Badi al-Sindi – who seem to be the minority in comparison to those listed above.

The likes of Abu Alqama will probably now say that Abdal Fattah is unreliable etc. We can say the same for his Imam al-Albani. The same applies to Bakr Abu Zayd – who was attacked even by al-Albani in his *Tamam al-Minna*. Bakr was also refuted for his own tahrifat by others. This is what al-Albani thought of Bakr Abu Zayd in his *Tamam al-Minna* (p. 32):

لقد كان في بحثه بعيدا عن التحقيق العلمي ، والتجرد من التعصب المذهبي على خلاف ما كنا نظن به ، فإنه غلب عليه نقل ما يوافقه وطي ما يخالفه ، أو إبعاده عن موضعه المناسب له إن نقله ، بحيث لا ينتبه القارئ لكونه حجة عليه لا له

Hence, the broken and grammatically flawed sentence by Abu Alqama above:

[quote=Abu Alqama] So all muhadith who narrates from people and do not weaken them, then its narrators are thiqqa, so all majhool in books of hadeeth and muhadith narrating them not saying they are majhool, then it is taqtheeq [/quote]

Is another example of his ta’assub, hastiness and his demonstration of the lack of knowledge he has in this noble Science of hadith that has been hijacked all too readily and easily by these upstarts from the Asaghir. Will his likes say that all those Ulama listed above who endorsed the point that if a narrator has no jarh recorded against him in any books of Jarh wa Ta’dil, or is not listed in the books of weak narrators – is regarded to be an acceptable narrator – should also be called Quburiyya?!

Answering the claim that al-A'mash al-Kufi committed Tadlis in his narration from Abu Salih al-Samman

On top of the claim that Malik al-Dar is majhul and the alleged disconnection in the Isnad between Abu Salih al-Samman and Malik al-Dar, some of the claimants to the Ahlul-Hadith have also raised the baseless claim that al-A'mash may have committed Tadlis when he used the term 'an' (from) in his narration from Abu Salih in the sanad back to Malik al-Dar!

Their own Imam – al-Albani, did not raise this objection of possible Tadlis from al-A'mash nor did he claim that there is a break in the sanad between Abu Salih and Malik. Al-Albani's principal objection was that Malik al-Dar was majhul. It seems that the likes of Abu Alqama have apparently discovered more than al-Albani did on this narration!

The version recorded in the Musannaf of ibn Abi Shayba mentions the following sanad and text:

حدثنا أبو معاوية ، عن الأعمش ، عن أبي صالح ، عن مالك الدار ، قال : وكان خازن عمر على الطعام ، قال : أصاب الناس قحط في زمن عمر ، فجاء رجل إلى قبر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال : يا رسول الله ، استسق لأمتك فإنهم قد هلكوا ، فأتى الرجل في المنام فقبل له : " انت عمر فأقرئه السلام ، وأخبره أنكم مستقيمون وقل له : عليك الكيس ، عليك الكيس " ، فأتى عمر فأخبره فبكى عمر ثم قال : يا رب لا آلو إلا ما عجزت عنه

Ibn Abi Shayba narrated it initially from Abu Mu'awiya. Abu Mu'awiya is known as: Muhammad ibn Khazim and his narrations are found in the Sihah Sitta. In the *Tabdhib al-Tabdhib* of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar (vol. 9) it mentioned the following on him:

[192] ع الستة محمد بن خازم التميمي السعدي مولا هم أبو معاوية الضرير الكوفي يقال عمي وهو بن ثمان سنين أو أربع روى عن عاصم الأحوال وأبي مالك الأشجعي وسعد ويحيى ابني سعيد الأنصاري والأعمش وداود بن أبي هند وعبيد الله بن عمر العمري وأبي بردة بريد بن عبد الله بن أبي بردة بن أبي موسى وإسماعيل بن أبي خالد وجعفر بن برقان وحجاج بن أرطاة وسهيل بن أبي صالح وأبي سفيان السعدي وأبي العميس وجوير بن سعيد وخالد بن إلياس وهشام بن عروة ومالك بن مغول ومحمد بن سوقة ويزيد بن زياد بن أبي الجعد وهشام بن

حسان وخلق كثير وعنه إبراهيم وابن جريج وهو أكبر منه ويحيى القطان وهو من أقرانه ويحيى بن حسان التنيسي وأسد بن موسى وأحمد بن حنبل وإسحاق بن راهويه وأبو الوليد الطيالسي وأبو بكر وعثمان ابنا أبي شيبة وسعيد بن منصور وعلي بن عبد الله المديني ومحمد بن سلام البيكندي ومسدد ويحيى بن يحيى النيسابوري وأبو كريب ومحمد بن عبد الله بن غير ويوسف بن عيسى المروزي ويحيى بن جعفر البيكندي وأحمد بن منيع وأحمد بن سنان القطان وسعيد بن يحيى بن أزهر وسهل بن عثمان العسكري وصدقة بن الفضل وعمرو بن محمد بن بكير الناقد وقتيبة بن سعيد ووهب بن بقية وهناد بن السري وأبو موسى محمد بن المثنى وعلي بن حرب الطائي والحسن بن عرفة وسعدان بن نصر وأحمد بن عبد الجبار العطاردي وآخرون قال أيوب بن إسحاق بن سافري سألت أحمد ويحيى عن أبي معاوية وجريرو قالوا أبو معاوية أحب إلينا يعنيان في الأعمش وقال عبد الله بن أحمد سمعت أبي يقول أبو معاوية الضير في غير حديث الأعمش مضطرب لا يحفظها حفظا جيدا وقال الدوري عن بن معين أبو معاوية أثبت في الأعمش من جريرو وروى أبو معاوية عن عبيد الله بن عمر مناكير وقال معاوية بن صالح سألت بن معين من أثبت أصحاب الأعمش قال أبو معاوية بعد شعبة وسفيان وقال عثمان الدارمي قلت لابن معين أبو معاوية أحب إليك في الأعمش أو وكيع فقال أبو معاوية أعلم به وقال بن أبي خيثمة قيل لابن معين أيهما أحب إليك في الأعمش عيسى بن يونس أو حفص بن غياث قال أبو معاوية وقال أيضا عن بن معين قال لنا وكيع من تلمذون قلنا نلزم أبا معاوية قال أما أنه كان يعد علينا في حياة الأعمش ألفا وسبعمائة وقال الدوري قلت لابن معين كان أبو معاوية أحسنهم حديثا عن الأعمش قال كانت الأحاديث الكبار العالية عنده وقال بن المديني كتبنا عن أبي معاوية ألفا وخمسمائة حديث وكان عند الأعمش ما لم يكن عند أبي معاوية أربع مائة ونيف وخمسون حديثا وقال شبابة بن سوار كنا عند شعبة فجاء أبو معاوية فقال شعبة هذا صاحب الأعمش فاعرفوه وقال إبراهيم الحربي قال وكيع ما أدركنا أحدا كان أعلم بأحاديث الأعمش عن أبي معاوية وقال الحسين بن إدريس قلت لابن عمار علي بن مسهر أكبر أم أبو معاوية في الأعمش قال أبو معاوية قال بن عمار سمعته يقول كل حديث قلت فيه حدثنا فهو ما حفظته من في الحدث وكل حديث قلت وذكر فلان فهو مما قرئ من كتاب وقال العجلي كوفي ثقة وكان يرى الإرجاء وكان لين القول فيه وقال يعقوب بن شيبة كان من الثقات وربما دلس وكان يرى الإرجاء وقال الآجري عن أبي داود مرجنا وقال مرة كان رئيس المرجئة بالكوفة وقال النسائي ثقة وقال بن خراش صدوق وهو في الأعمش ثقة وفي غيره فيه اضطراب وذكره بن حبان في الثقات وقال كان حافظا متقنا ولكنه كان مرجنا خبيثا قال أحمد بن حنبل وغير واحد مات سنة 113 وقال بن غير مات سنة 4 وقال بن المديني وآخرون مات سنة خمس وتسعين ومائة قلت وقال بن سعد كان ثقة كثير الحديث يدللس وكان مرجنا وقال النسائي ثقة في الأعمش وقال أبو زرعة كان يرى الإرجاء قيل له كان يدعو إليه قال نعم وقال بن أبي حاتم عن أبيه الناس أثبت في الأعمش سفيان ثم أبو معاوية ومعتز بن سليمان أحب إلي من أبي معاوية يعني في غير حديث الأعمش وقال أبو داود قلت لأحمد كيف حديث أبي معاوية عن هشام بن عروة قال فيها أحاديث مضطربة يرفع منها أحاديث إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

Ibn Hajr said the following about Abu Mu'awiya in summary to the above in *al-Taqrīb*

[5841] محمد بن خازم بمعجمتين أبو معاوية الضرير الكوفي عمي وهو صغير ثقة أحفظ الناس الحديث الأعمش وقد يهيم في حديث غيره من كبار التاسعة مات سنة خمس وتسعين وله اثنتان وثمانون سنة وقد رمي بالإرجاء ع

This last point from Ibn Hajar mentions that Abu Mu'awiya was Thiqa and the best preserver of narrations from al-A'mash amongst the people.

Secondly, Ibn Hajar mentioned the following about al-A'mash in *al-Taqrīb*:

[2615] سليمان بن مهران الأسدي الكاهلي أبو محمد الكوفي الأعمش ثقة حافظ عارف بالقراءات ورع لكنه يدلّس من الخامسة مات سنة سبع وأربعين أو ثمان وكان مولده أول سنة إحدى وستين ع

Al-A'mash was declared to be a Thiqa hafiz (a trustworthy hafiz of hadith) though he did commit tadlis at times his narrations are also found in the Sihah Sitta.

One of the brothers has already shown briefly that al-A'mash did not commit Tadlis from scholars like Abu Salih. This is what he mentioned based on al-Dhahabi's *Mizān al-I'tidāl* (no. 3517):¹⁴

Imam Dhahabī comments: "When A'mash begins a tradition with the word 'an (from) there is a possibility of imposture and deception. But if he relates it from his elders like Ibrāhīm, Ibn Abū Wā'il, **Abū Sālih Sammān**, etc., then it is presumed to possess sound linkage (ittisāl).[27] In addition, Imam Dhahabī has also described him as trustworthy (thiqah).

Hence, there is continuity between al-A'mash and Abu Salih as al-Dhahabi indicated. This will be shown from the agreement of the two Shaykhs - al-Bukhari and Muslim from the Sahihayn below.

¹⁴ <http://hadithproofsfortawassul.blogspot.com/2005/11/hadith-3-response-to-al-albanis.html>

The arabic quote from al-Dhahabi being:

قلت : وهو يدلّس ، وربما دلّس عن ضعيف ، ولا يدري به ، فمتى قال حدثنا فلا كلام ، ومتى قال " عن " تطرق إلى احتمال التدليس إلا في شيوخ له أكثر عنهم : كإبراهيم ، وابن أبي وائل ، وأبى صالح السمان ، فإن روايته عن هذا الصنف محمولة على الاتصال

As for Abu Salih, then he is known as Dhakwan Abu Salih al-Samman. Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar mentioned in his *al-Taqreeb* the following on Abu Salih's status:

[1841] ذكوان أبو صالح السمان الزيات المدني ثقة ثبت وكان يجلب الزيت إلى الكوفة من الثالثة مات سنة إحدى ومائة ع

The last quote shows that Abu Salih was from Madina, he was Thiqa thabt (trustworthy and firmly established) and his narrations are found in the Sihah Sitta.

Since he was from Madina he would have been in an ideal situation to hear from Malik al-Dar who was the treasurer in Madina as is known.

Examples from Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim with the isnâd link: Abu Mua'wiya – al-A'mash – Abu Salih:

From sahih al-Bukhari

صحيح البخاري، الجزء الثالث << 68 - كتاب التفسير. << 415 - باب: {يوم ينفخ في الصور فتأتون أفواجا} /18/: زمرا.

4651 - حدثني محمد: أخبرنا أبو معاوية، عن الأعمش، عن أبي صالح، عن أبي هريرة رضي الله عنه قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم:

(ما بين النفختين أربعون). قال: أربعون يوماً؟ قال: أبيت، قال: أربعون شهراً؟ قال: أبيت، قال: أربعون سنة؟ قال: أبيت. قال: (ثم يترل الله من السماء ماء، فينبتون كما ينبت البقل، ليس من الإنسان شيء إلا يبلى، إلا عظما واحدا وهو عجب الذنب، ومنه يركب الخلق يوم القيامة).

صحيح البخاري،

الجزء الأول << 11 - أبواب المساجد. << 53 - باب: الصلاة في مسجد السوق.

465 - حدثنا مسدد قال: حدثنا أبو معاوية، عن الأعمش، عن أبي صالح، عن أبي هريرة، عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال:

(صلاة الجميع تزيد على صلاته في بيته، وصلاته في سوقه، خمسا وعشرين درجة، فإن أحدكم إذا توضأ فأحسن، وأتى المسجد، لا يريد إلا الصلاة، لم يخط خطوة إلا رفعه الله بها درجة، وحط عنه خطيئة، حتى يدخل المسجد،

وإذا دخل المسجد، كان في صلاة ما كانت تحبسه، وتصلّي - يعني - عليه الملائكة، ما دام في مجلسه الذي يصلي فيه: اللهم اغفر له، اللهم ارحمه، ما لم يحدث فيه).

From Sahih Muslim

صحيح مسلم. الجزء الأول << 1 - كتاب الإيمان >> (21) باب تفاضل أهل الإيمان فيه، ورجحان أهل اليمن فيه

90 - (52) حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة وأبو كريب، قالوا: حدثنا أبو معاوية عن الأعمش، عن أبي صالح، عن أبي هريرة؛ قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "أتاكم أهل اليمن. هم ألين قلوباً وأرق أفئدة. الإيمان يمان والحكمة يمانية. رأس الكفر قبل المشرق".
(52) وحدثنا قتيبة بن سعيد وزهير بن حرب، قالوا: حدثنا جرير عن الأعمش بهذا الإسناد. ولم يذكر "رأس الكفر قبل المشرق".

صحيح مسلم. الجزء الأول << 1 - كتاب الإيمان >> (35) باب بيان إطلاق اسم الكفر على من ترك الصلاة

133 - (81) حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة وأبو كريب، قالوا: حدثنا أبو معاوية عن الأعمش، عن أبي صالح، عن أبي هريرة؛ قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: "إذا قرأ ابن آدم السجدة فسجد، اعتزل الشيطان بيكي. يقول: يا ويله. (وفي رواية أبي كريب يا ويلي). أمر ابن آدم بالسجود فسجد فله الجنة. وأمرت بالسجود فأبيت فلي النار".

House of Verification

صحيح مسلم. الجزء الأول << 1 - كتاب الإيمان >> (46) باب بيان غلظ تحريم إسبال الإزار والمن بالعطية وتنفيق السلعة بالهلف. وبيان الثلاثة الذين لا يكلمهم الله يوم القيامة ولا ينظر إليهم ولا يزكّيهم ولهم عذاب أليم

173 - (108) وحدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي شيبة وأبو كريب، قالوا: حدثنا أبو معاوية، عن الأعمش، عن أبي صالح، عن أبي هريرة؛ وهذا حديث أبي بكر. قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم "ثلاث لا يكلمهم الله يوم القيامة ولا ينظر إليهم ولا يزكّيهم ولهم عذاب أليم: رجل على فضل ماء بالفلاة يمنع من ابن السبيل. ورجل بايع رجلاً بسبعة بعد العصر فحلف له بالله

لأخذها بكذا وكذا فصدقه، وهو على غير ذلك. ورجل بايع إماما لا يبايعه إلا لدنيا، فإن أعطاه منها وفى، وإن لم يعطه منها لم يف".

Al-Hafiz ibn Hajar mentioned in the introduction to *Fath al-Bari*, known as *Hadi al-Sari* (p. 303) the following point about this connected link:

أبو معاوية هو محمد بن خازم بمعجمتين عن الأعمش سليمان بن مهران عن أبي صالح ذكوان تكرر كثيرا وهو من أصح الأسانيد

This last quote shows that al-Hafiz regarded the chain: Abu Mu'awiya – al-A'mash – Abu Salih to be the most authentic of chains of transmission (min assahh al-asanid) and it is repeated often in Sahih al-Bukhari. There are more examples in Sahih Muslim than Sahih al-Bukhari for this common link.

In those examples from Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim there is an'ana utilised by al-A'mash from Abu Salih, but the two Shaykhs did not consider there to be tadlis in this type of link where al-A'mash used the term "an" (from) when narrating from Abu Salih. This is conclusive to show that Imam al-Dhahabi was correct in his claim mentioned above regarding al-A'mash not making tadlis from Shuyukh like Abu Salih.

Indeed, the likes of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar and before him, Imam ibn Kathir did not identify this claim of a hidden defect (illa) if al-A'mash used an-ana to link his narration from Abu Salih al-Samman. In conclusion, there is no problem or tadlis in the above common link, thus the isnad going back to Malik al-Dar via that common link is also Sahih.

House of Verification

The likes of Abu Alqama need to show conclusively why they are at odds with al-Bukhari, Muslim, al-Dhahabi, Ibn Kathir, Ibn Hajar and it appears also al-Albani – none of whom mentioned this claim that al-A'mash may have committed tadlis when reporting from Abu Salih al-Samman.

[quote=Abu Alqama]

Abul Hassan said : The Malik al-Dar narration was also known to al-Hafiz ibn Abdal Barr in his al-Isti'ab (2/464, under the biography of Umar ibn al Khattab)

So here he used the same fabricated rule, saying

Ibn Abdal Barr did not criticise this narration in any way, just as Abu Ya'la al-Khalili did not in his Kitab al-Irshad after narrating it with his isnâd and the similar matn

So here all narrations a muhaddith quote and do not weaken are saheeh and its narrator thiqqah for them

These are thje rules of Qubooriyah [/quote]

I say: This is not a rule or an evidence, nor have we fabricated anything to date to establish our claims Insha'allah. Rather, the reason why I mentioned that Ibn Abdal Barr and al-Khalili mentioned it was to demonstrate to your ilk that the narration was not deemed to be a wasila to Shirk al-Akbar by these Ulama! If it was the case then why did these earlier Huffaz not rule it to be a Khabar, which leads to Shirk? That was the reason for mentioning that – not as this misinterpreter and slanderer thinks by calling people Quburiyya! May Allah guide this Hashwi who believes that Allah is literally settled (istiqrar) on the Arsh!

Did al-Albani fabricate a principle in Hadith Ya Abu Alqama when he declared a sanad to be Hasan on the mere basis that a man is known as a Muhaddith of Baghdad alone?! Or may be you should admit that al-Albani is a contradicter on the issue of accepting the narrations of those who are majhûl al-haal at times and rejecting them on other occasions?! Just as he contradicted himself by declaring another sanad recorded by al-Tabarani going back to Malik al-Dar again, to be Hasan, in his tahqiq to al-Mundhiri's Targhib al-tarhib! Your likes are quick to save the contradictory faces of your own Ulama but harsh and hasty in ridiculing those whom you malign as "Quburiyya"! Let the reader take note of the games of these asaghir min al-Hashwiyya.

Does he think that Ibn Kathir – student of ibn Taymiyya was encouraging Shirk when he authenticated that narration under discussion?! Would he like to say clearly that Ibn Kathir was a Quburi for promoting this narration with its Tashih in two separate books?! Or how about those Ulama, including Ibn Kathir, who spread the story attributed to al-Utbi. Will he dare call them all Mushrikin?! Or will he jump around with his sarcastic deductions?! His deductions are flip-flops, which are irrelevant and incoherent to the specific topic of the Malik al-Dar narration as well.

[quote=Abu Alqama]

If Ibn Abdil Barr was to quote any hadeeth agianmst AHnaf and being quiet

and it had a majhool narrator, then these people would never accept it.
[/quote]

This has nothing to do with the Malik al-Dar narration – so his sidetracking is useless. Every narration needs to be dealt on its own merits with an investigation of who said what on it. This is the way of the Ulama unlike the Ahlul Ahwa. I am convinced that Abu Alqama himself would not accept everything that Ibn Abdal Barr claimed. An example is the fact that Ibn Abdal Barr preferred 20 Rak'ats of Taraweeh and he answered some of those narrations regarding 8 Rak'ats in his *al-Istidhkar*. Abu Alqama is one of those who oppose 20 Rak'ats of Taraweeh inline with al-Albani and others.

[quote=Abu Alqama]

Sarfrza Khan ansered in his books to brawliyah, and wekened some narratrions from Mustadrak and others, saying narrators are majhool, Hakim is mutasahil.

And Sarfraz Khan clearly said that muhadith also quote fabricated ahadeeth, so their quoting fabrications and lies does not mean these hadeeth and narrators are saheeh.

So here, Abul Hassan is using rules of Bralwi, this Muhadith quoted this hadeeth, so it is saheeh, while the narrator has been declared thiqqah by nobody.

Abul Hassan is a real brwlai in his treracheries and forgeries on ilmu Hadeeth. [/quote]

What on earth has Sarfraz Khan got to do with this narration from Malik al-Dar? Nothing as far as I can see. So this Kadhhab who called me a Barelwi has got his facts twisted, just as he had when he thought of me as a “Deobandi” or a “Kawthari” or whatever falsity he threw as mud slinging words to demean me. This writer had said more than a year ago the following:

“Continuing on the last name, let it be known to the bare faced liars amongst the Asaghir who visit this forum that I do not acknowledge or personally endorse the views of anyone who contradicts soundly established fundamentals in aqeeda, be it from: Abdullah al-Habashi, M.S.R. al-Bouti, Hasan al-Saqqaf, Hisham Kabbani, GF Haddad, Nuh Keller, Hamza Yusuf or before them all: Muhammad Zahid al-Kawthari, Ahmad al-Ghumari etc etc. These are recent contemporaries and are not our major Imams in aqeeda, and they are men who can make mistakes and

may hold Shadh views that we need not follow, endorse, let alone acknowledge. Patently, we do not recognise them as Imams whose words establish the Hujja of a creedal doctrine on us. Rather, those named usually quote those before them in their personal aqa'id."

Also, I said:

"Where the Haqq is found, that should be the priority. The Haqq is known by the soundness of its evidence and its detailed explanation by the Imams of Huda whose status is esteemed and uncontroversial to the bulk of the major Ulama. Our major Imams are from the earlier part of Islamic history, and their remnants in status, knowledge or similar rank have appeared amongst the Mujaddidin, Mufassirin, Muhaddithin and Fuqaha via the centuries, as Allah has willed. The Ta'ifatul Mansura is a reality, and it's the group known as al-Sawad al-A'zam in other Ahadith. This group and its men are known and their aqeeda is closest to the way of the Qur'an and Sunna. Those who lack Muttasil Asanid back to these higher authorities are not genuine defenders of sound Islamic creed, but are usually the exponents of batil and on other occasions they mix the Haqq with Batil to spread their claims further to the unwitting masses.

Our aqeeda is not something that is new or formulated afresh - but it is what has reached us from al-Salaf al-Salih via Mutawatir and Muttasil Asanid. We need not make Taqleed in aqeeda like the Asaghir do in many positions fanatically from the likes of ibn Taymiyya. The Asaghir claim the way of the Salaf, but in many issues they contradict the Salaf and it is rare to find one amongst them who took aqeeda with a Sanad back to the Aimmatus-Salaf. Even the likes of al-Albani had little authority when it came to possessing the Isnad like the great Ulama of the past did. The Asaghir today are mere parrot fashioned callers to the findings of their so-called Kibar Ulama like: Ibn Baz, ibn Uthaymin, al-Albani et al... In Aqeeda, fiqh and even the grading of Ahadith into sound and false... They are the worst example of Taqleed, something they warn most people to avoid. With them, this maxim holds most true:

"Do as I say not as I do!"

Take note O Asaghir, that the Shaykh who gave al-Albani an Ijaza Aama (a general Ijaza for the sake of Baraka alone) was Shaykh Muhammad Raghīb al-Tabbakh al-Halabi. O Asaghir - do you know who he was? Have you seen his Thabat in Hadith and what he transmitted? He was Hanafi in Madhhab, Ash'ari in Aqeeda according to his surviving student from Halab: Dr Ibrahim al-Salqini, as Allah is my witness. Shaykh

Raghib al-Tabbakh was a friend to your enemy: Shaykh al-Kawthari. The latter wrote a brief and praiseworthy article on the death of Shaykh al-Tabbakh in his Maqalat. Shaykh Raghib called Shaykh al-Kawthari: "Al-Alim al-Fadil" in his notes to Hafiz al-Iraqi's Sharh on ibn al Salah's Muqaddima. Shaykh Raghib's true successors are his late student, the fellow Halabi: Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda (d. 1997) and the currently alive: Dr Nurud-Din Itr al-Halabi then Dimashqi. These men are also Hanafi and have no problem with the way of Asha'ira and Maturidiyya. Hence, when these Asaghir attack, they should not forget that there own "Muhaddith al-Asr" also took from a Hanafi/Ash'ari!

AR Qadri was also devastatingly humiliated when his own Imam: Ahmad al-Ghumari and his aqeeda plus manhaj were shown up as indicated above. This individual also failed to respond adequately when Shaykh Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut was attacked by a pseudo-Salafi called: Khalid al-Shaya from Riyadh. Most surprisingly, his pseudo-Salafi associates at the forum he posts at (and who visit here and post crass comments after departing from here) failed to challenge the Karachi based one on the allegations that Shaykh Shu'ayb made Ta'wil on the Sifat narrations. Now, if it weren't for one calling himself "Salafist" - I wouldn't have hesitated to label them all with hypocrisy for their shrieking silence on this affair alone! Hiding the truth is their manhaj and shouting with snipped quotes is their way today. May Allah save us from their Fitna and guide them to their senses, for they are also notorious for attacking each other with slanderous slurs and refutations, to the extent of physical fisticuffs on the streets and Masjids of all places."

Hence, Abu Alqama accusing us of treachery and forgery is his self-invention created out of his desperation to oppose the grading of earlier Huffaz like Ibn Kathir and Ibn Hajar and many other contemporaries who all agreed on the authenticity of the Malik al-Dar narration! It is also bewildering to see how this Hashwi – Abu Alqama attempted to use the work of Ahmed al-Ghumari in radd to al-Kawthari, but also failed to mention that Abdullah al-Talidi – one of the surviving students of Ahmed al-Ghumari mentioned that his Shaykh took back his earlier radd on al-Kawthari. Then how is it that al-Ghumari is a witness for the likes of Abu Alqama when the same Ahmed al-Ghumari also defended Tawassul and his work has recently been printed?! On top of that, Ahmed al-Ghumari was anti-Mua'wiya, anti-Ibn Taymiyya and declared the Wahhabiyya to be the Khawarij of the time! Let the reader see how desperate this Hashwi really is in the low depths he has tripped into, in order to blacken the names of anyone he thinks is a "Quburi" or

“Madhhabī” or “Ash’arī”! O Hashwī isn’t Ahmed al-Ghumārī a Qubūrī to you?

Abu Alqama failed to admit the fact that his colleagues: Abu Khuzayma and Abu Hibban tampered with quotes, as did al-Albani. He failed so miserably to defend them let alone admit that they tampered! Indeed, these two who call themselves Abu Khuzayma and Abu Hibban also lied against Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal by claiming that the Imam used to place his hands upon the chest in Salah!

See here:

How al-Albani cut off the words of Qadi Iyad:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=7010>

Distortions of Abu Alqama’s friends:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=7104>

In the last link one can also see things that this Hashwī would probably deem to be the acts of the “Qubūrīyya” – but he has failed to admit what he personally thinks about the following mentioned in the link:

Dawud ibn Salih said: "[The governor of Madīna] Marwan [ibn al-Hakam] one day saw a man placing his face on top of the grave of the Prophet. He said: "Do you know what you are doing?" When he came near him, he realized it was Abu Ayyub al-Ansari. The latter said: "Yes; I came to the Prophet, not to a stone." Ibn Hibban in his Sahih, Ahmad (5:422), Al-Tabarani in his Mu`jam al-Kabir (4:189) and his Awsat according to Haythami in al-Zawa'id (5:245 and 5:441 #5845 Book of Hajj, "Section on the honoring of the dwellers of Madīna, chapter on placing one's face against the grave of our Master the Prophet saws" and #9252 Book of Khilafa, "Chapter on the leadership of those unworthy of it"), al-Hakim in his Mustadrak (4:515); both the latter and al-Dhahabi said it was sahih. It is also cited by al-Subki in Shifa' al-siqam (p. 126) and Ibn Taymiyya in al-Muntaqa (2:261f.).

May be the likes of Abu Alqama and his colleagues can talk about these positions attributed to Ibn Hibban in his *Kitab al-Thiqat*:

موسى بن جعفر بن محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب أبو علي بن موسى الرضا وهو علي بن البيت وعقلائهم وجلة الهاشميين ونبلائهم يجب أن يعتبر حديثه إذا روى عنه غير أولاده الحسن من سادات أهل لأبي الصلت ولأولاده وشيعته وأبي الصلت خاصة فإن الأخبار التي رويت عنه وتبين بواطيل إنما الذنب فيها الرضا بطوس من شربة سقاها إياها المأمون وشيعته لأنه في نفسه كان أجل من أن يكذب ومات علي بن موسى سنة ثلاث ومائتين وقبره بسنا باذ خارج النوقان مشهور يزار فمات من ساعته وذلك في يوم السبت آخر يوم مرارا كثيرة وما حلت بي شدة في وقت مقامى بطوس فزرت قبر علي بن موسى الرضا بمجنب قبر الرشيد قد زرتة شيء جربته الله على جده وعليه ودعوت الله إزالتها عنى إلا أستجيب لي وزالت عنى تلك الشدة وهذا صلوات وعليهم أجمعين مرارا فوجدته كذلك أماننا الله على محبة المصطفى وأهل بيته الله عليه

Ibn Hajar in his *Tabdhib al-Tabdhib* mentioned the following about Ibn Khuzayma:

في ترجمة الإمام علي بن موسى الرضا ما يلي

أهل النيسابوري (وسمعت أبا بكر محمد بن المؤمل بن الحسن بن عيسى يقول خرجنا مع امام قال (الحاكم متوافرون إلى زيارة قبر الحديث أبي بكر بن خزيمة وعديله أبي علي الثقفي مع جماعة من مشائخنا وهم إذ ذاك من تعظيمه يعنى ابن خزيمة لتلك البقعة علي بن موسى الرضى بطوس) ومشهده بها معروف يزار قال فرأيت تحيرن وتواضعه لها وتضرعه عندها ما

Also, from Imam al-Dhahabi's *Mu'jam al-Shuyukh* (1:73, no. 58):

Ahmad ibn al-Mun'im related to us... [with his chain of transmission] from Ibn Umar that the latter disliked to touch the Prophet's -- Allah bless and greet him -- grave. I say: He disliked it because he considered it disrespect. Ahmad ibn Hanbal was asked about touching the Prophet's -- Allah bless and greet him -- grave and kissing it and he saw nothing wrong with it. His son Abd Allah related this from him. If it is asked: "Why did the Companions not do this?" We reply: "Because they saw him with their very eyes when he was alive, enjoyed his presence directly, kissed his very hand, nearly fought each other over the remnants of his ablution water, shared his purified hair on the day of the greater Pilgrimage, and even if he spat it would virtually not fall except in someone's hand so that he could pass it over his face. Since we have not had the tremendous fortune of sharing in this, we throw ourselves on his grave as a mark of commitment, reverence,

and acceptance, even to kiss it. Do you not see what Thabit al-Bunani did when he kissed the hand of Anas ibn Malik and placed it on his face saying: "This is the hand that touched the hand of Allah's Messenger"? Muslims are not moved to these matters except by their excessive love for the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him --, as they are ordered to love Allah and the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him -- more than their own lives, their children, all human beings, their property, and Paradise and its maidens. There are even some believers that love Abu Bakr and `Umar more than themselves...

Do you not you see that the Companions, in the excess of their love for the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him --, asked him: "Should we not prostrate to you?" and he replied no, and if he had allowed them, they would have prostrated to him as a mark of utter veneration and respect, not as a mark of worship, just as the brothers of the Prophet Yusuf prostrated to him. Similarly the prostration of the Muslim to the grave of the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him -- is for the intention of magnification and reverence. One is not to be accused of disbelief because of it whatsoever (la yukaffaru aslan), but he is being disobedient [to the Prophet's injunction to the Companions]. Let him, therefore, be informed that this is forbidden. It is likewise in the case of one who prays towards the grave."

Do you not you see that the Companions, in the excess of their love for the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him --, asked him: "Should we not prostrate to you?" and he replied no, and if he had allowed them, they would have prostrated to him as a mark of utter veneration and respect, not as a mark of worship, just as the brothers of the Prophet Yusuf prostrated to him. Similarly the prostration of the Muslim to the grave of the Prophet -- Allah bless and greet him -- is for the intention of magnification and reverence. One is not to be accused of disbelief because of it whatsoever (la yukaffaru aslan), but he is being disobedient [to the Prophet's injunction to the Companions]. Let him, therefore, be informed that this is forbidden. It is likewise in the case of one who prays towards the grave."

Ya Hashwiyya answer these Ulama like al-Dhahabi and Imam Ahmed if you can and call them "Quburiyya" if you dare.

See here for a reply to Abu Alqama who posted under the name "Abu Taymiya" here:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showthread.php?t=6114>

[quote=Abu Alqama]

He did not find any Imam declaring malik dar to be thiqah, so he just said this one and this one quoted and quoted means it is saheeh.

So all fabrications in books of hadeeth, Bazar, Tabarani and Darimi, and others and they did not weaken them would mean all these mawdoo'at are saheeh.

Abul Hassan is just trying to deceive people with his separate rules of hadeeth, and his forcing a majhool man to be thiqah.

Rather if people like Ali ibn Madeeni and Ahmad mentioned Malik Dar and did not say he was thiqah, then it would rather show he is majhool.

But he turns rules like Zahid Kawthari, follows weak sayings of muhadith about Majhool.

And Malik Dar is Sahabi for very little some, you can see yourself, he is a tabii from majority, but why Abul Hassan bases on Thann to justify his creed.

Because he has nothing saheeh or agreed upon by the Ummah about Istishfa, and if ever it was mashroo, there should be at least one saheeh hadeeth with all thiqah narrators for all muhadith, while Ahnaf do require Muataweatir or mashoor for things that cannot remain hidden. [/quote]

So here, Abu Alqama lied by saying that no one declared Malik al-Dar to be Thiqah. Why did he forget to mention that Ibn Hibban did declare him in his Thiqat, then the words of Ibn Sa'd and al-Khalili are strong enough to show that Malik is not majhul and his narrations were sound enough to be declared Sahih by Ibn Kathir and Ibn Hajar; on top of that his own Imam – al-Albani did declare a narration from Malik al-Dar as recorded by al-Tabarani to be Hasan!

Now, Abu Alqama knows this very well about al-Albani – but he just can't explain why al-Albani did declare another narration from Malik al-Dar to be Hasan! Or is it a contradiction?! He has no proof to show why al-Albani came to the decision that the following narration is Hasan as he did in his Tahqiq to *al-Tarhib wal-Tarhib* of al-Mundhiri:

حسن موقوف وعن مالك الدار

أن عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه أخذ أربعمئة دينار فجعلها في صرة فقال للغلام اذهب بها إلى أبي عبيدة بن الجراح ثم تله في البيت ساعة حتى تنظر ما يصنع؟ فذهب بها الغلام إليه فقال يقول لك أمير المؤمنين اجعل هذه في بعض حاجتك فقال وصله الله ورحمه ثم قال تعالي يا جارية اذهبي بهذه السبعة إلى فلان وبهذه الخمسة إلى فلان وبهذه الخمسة إلى فلان حتى أنفذها ورجع الغلام إلى عمر فأخبره فوجده قد أعد مثلها لمعاذ بن جبل فقال اذهب بها إلى معاذ بن جبل وتله في البيت [ساعة] حتى تنظر ما يصنع فذهب بها إليه فقال يقول لك أمير المؤمنين اجعل هذه في بعض حاجتك فقال رحمه الله ووصله تعالي يا جارية اذهبي إلى بيت فلان بكذا اذهبي إلى بيت فلان بكذا اذهبي إلى بيت فلان بكذا فاطلعت امرأة معاذ وقالت نحن والله مساكين فأعطينا فلم يبق في الخرقه إلا ديناران فدحى بهما إليها ورجع الغلام إلى عمر فأخبره فسر بذلك فقال إنهم إخوة بعضهم من بعض

رواه الطبراني في الكبير ورواته إلى مالك الدار ثقات مشهورون ومالك الدار لا أعرفه
تله هو بفتح التاء المثناة فوق واللام أيضا وتشديد الهاء أي تشاغل
فدحى بهما بالحاء المهملة أي رمى بهما

The real deceiver of the masses here is this person who in the past posted under at least 2 different screen names on Sunni Forum! May be he can tell us what he posts under at “Sunnipress” as well.

Al-Kawthari did say that the Malik al-Dar narration is Sahih and he based that not on his hawa but he quoted Ibn Hajar from his *Fath al-Bari*. Hence, al-Kawthari was not the ultimate reference for any Sunni in this time – but those who came centuries earlier. Sayyid Abdullah al-Ghumari also authenticated it as did his students like Mahmud Mamduh in agreement with the earlier and established Huffaz of Hadith: Ibn Kathir and ibn Hajar al-Asqalani.

As for this issue of Tawassul – then he needs to answer all the other narrations and their analysis that has been presented to date with precise quotes from Ulama, rather than his futile guess work.

Let him look at this for more:

<http://hadithproofsfortawassul.blogspot.com/2005/11/hadith-proofs-for-tawassul.html>

[quote=Abu Alqama]

They required tawatur for Raful ydayn as Kashmiri in urf Shazee and Sarkhasi in Mabsoot, but here they have only one hadeeth, with no muhadith saying Malik Dar was thiqah. [/quote]

Another lie! Malik was declared thiqah by ibn Hibban and words of Ta'dil have come from Ibn Sa'd, and al-Khalili, while Ibn Kathir, Ibn Hajar and many contemporaries accepted his narration, as did al-Albani on one occasion! Using the rule of lifting the state of being majhûl according to al-Daraqutni and others would also lead to the point that these Ulama would also have no problem if someone was to deem Malik al-Dar to be known (ma'ruf), while al-Daraqutni's statement leads to the declaration of adala for Malik al-Dar. I can't see what raful yadayn and al-Kashmiri has to do with this narration from Malik al-Dar. That is just more digression from the ranting inconsistencies of the likes of Abu Alqama.

[quote= Abu Alqama]

Abul Hassan is only deceiving ignorants, and Allah's Shareeha is based on yaqeen, and not this one was tressurer, he might be a Sahabi, and some muhadith made rules of majhool being thiqah with two thiqah narrating from him.

And Ahnaf are last to accept Ibn Hajar and others ibn Katheer when it against his madhab. Ibn Hajar said Zul Yadayn and Zu Shymalayn to be two people, yet Nimawi and Kashmiri said they are same, and tried to prove by this way that narration of ABu Hurayrah about Zul Yadayn was mursal Sahabi and abrogated...

So ABul Hassan is desperatly try to anthenticate this weak and ma'lool hadeeth, opposing Ijma of Sahabah.

Note : In hadeeth it is told that the Man who saw in dream the Prophet saw went to Umar and told him, but there is no mention that he told Umar as well that he asked Prophet saw to do Istishfa, rather the context tells he told his dread and the Prophet's order, and Umar cried saying he was defectious and late in this action.

So nowere it is told this man told Umar his istishfa, and Umar said : You reached the SUNnah, whenever you have a problem then go to the Grave of

the Prophet saw,

And Sahabah and Tbii had many problems, and this solution should have come in a mutawatir way from Salaf, not from a majhool man, with in narrators a majhool Tabii.....

Majhool and liras, that is all they can narrate from....

While intelligence asks muatawatir from this, Aloosi said in his tafseer, if it was true it would come from Ahle Bayt, Sahabi Tabieen, Aimah...

But we have nothing saheeh from them about that.

What greater daleel for normal intelligence to reject that.

But yet Abul Hassan has destroyed his intellegence, corrupted it with tasawwuf and in this majnoon state, he is trying to misguide the Ummah and alter the Noble SHaree'ah

MAY Allah protect us from Qubooriyah[/quote]

This is all ignorant talk in very poor English grammar. This person has not been able to prove anything significant so he thinks he can now try winning an argument by accusing people of treachery, fabrication, inventing Hadith rules, bringing in irrelevant side issues, claiming that Malik is majhul, that no one did tawthiq on him and declaring people Quburiyyah!

Rather, the Ilm of Hadith is taken from the earlier Huffaz and not from Asaghir who live in France or his references from the so-called "Ahl-e-Hadith" of his original land!

Ya Abu Alqama, your saying:

"But yet Abul Hassan has destroyed his intellegence, corrupted it with tasawwuf and in this majnoon state, he is trying to misguide the Ummah and alter the Noble SHaree'ah"

Should have been directed first to Ibn Kathir and Ibn Hajr who authenticated this narration O Muta'assib! Then we know that your Imam al-Albani contradicted himself by admitting once that another of Malik al-Dar's narrations is Hasan in his "Sahih" *Targhib wal tarhib*, and your excuses for him are useless to our debate.

The incoherent and inconsistent nature of Abu Alqama's last quote shows that he is only one that knows how to rant and rave and not establish anything he says with any substantial and authoritative quotes from the Ulama al-Salihin.

The conclusion of all his baseless claims should have been primarily directed to those masters of hadith like Ibn Kathir and Ibn Hajar who authenticated and knew the meaning of that narration better than these unknown asaghir like "Abu Alqama".

As for his "interpretations" of the matn of the Malik al-Dar narration – then what relevance is it to hear this unknown one's claims when he has no reference to support his claim? It is clear that Abu Alqama is merely guessing at and surmising the meaning to the Malik al-Dar narration from his own bias. Rather, he should leave his hawâ and claims and bring in the verified comments to this narration from those who knew this narration well, like Nurud-Din al-Samhudi in *Wafa al-Wafa*, Taqi al-Subki's *Shifa al-Siqam*, al-Qastallani in *Mawahib al-Laduniyya*, or its Sharh by al-Zarqani, or *Jawhar al-Munazzam* by Ibn Hajar al-Makki etc.

As for al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani O Hashwi – He was a Shafi'i, Ash'ari (as has come down to us via a Musalsal isnâd), had Hanafi students like Ibn al-Humam and Qasim ibn Qutlubugha, but now this same al-Hafiz ibn Hajar al-Asqalani has become the target of criticism for his explanations of narrations primarily linked to the Sifat of Allah by these Hashwiyya of the age. Let us see how ibn Hajar al-Asqalani made Tawassul O Hashwi.

AH Murad of Cambridge mentioned:

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Hajar departed this life in 852. His funeral was attended by 'fifty thousand people', including the sultan and the caliph; 'even the Christians grieved.' He was remembered as a gentle man, short, slender, and white-bearded, a lover of chess and calligraphy, much inclined to charity; 'good to those who wronged him, and forgiving to those he was able to punish.' A lifetime's proximity to the hadith had imbued him with a deep love of the Messenger (may Allah bless him and grant him peace), as is shown nowhere more clearly than in the poetry assembled in his Diwan, an original manuscript of which has been preserved at the Egyptian National Library. A few lines will suffice to show this well:

*By the gate of your generosity stands a sinner, who is
mad with love,*

O best of mankind in radiance of face and countenance!

*Through you he seeks a means [tawassala], hoping for
Allah's forgiveness of slips;*

*From fear of Him, his eyelid is wet with pouring
tears.*

*Although his genealogy attributes him to a stone
[hajar],*

How often tears have flowed, sweet, pure and fresh!

Praise of you does not do you justice, but perhaps,

*In eternity, its verses will be transformed into
mansions.*

My praise of you shall continue for as long as I live,

*For I see nothing that could ever deflect me from your
praise.*

Is the above ode from the pen of al-Hafiz ibn Hajar a Wasilla ila'l shirk O
Abu Alqama?

[Quote=Abu Alqama]

So here are some rules of Abul Hassan AL Kawthari

A Muhadith mentioning a narration and not weakening it means that it is
saheeh for him and narrators are thiqqah.

Being a treasurer is tawtheeq, so all governors of Umar and Uthman were
thiqqah...Some being accused of drinking wine...

A favored rejected rule of Ibn Hibban and ibn Khuzaymah about Majhool ul Hal and mastoor.

Being a Muhadith means being thiqqah....

Ya ABal Hassan, do you have other bateel rules like whatever is reported without isnad in hanafi books is saheeh if a faqeeh acted on it.

Or Whatever comes from Deobandi Imam is saheeh, as they have kashf and their kashf tells that these hadeeth are saheeh like ibn Arabi...

Abul Hassan, are ibn Hajar, Dhahabi and other sayings hujjah for you, so their weakening hadeeth of raful ydayn is hujjah for you ?

Abul Hassan, write a book of you own Mustalah ul Hadeeth...

Ilmul Hadeeth inda Abil Hassan AL Kawthari Al Majhool...

Like Sa'eed Mamdooh who autenticated fabricated juzz Mafqood....

It is sure if you learn hadeeth from their book, there can be a lot of damage to muslim creed...

Or maybe Hassan Saqqaf, or Alawi Maliki and other revilers of Sahabah...

Your own Imam Abu Haneefah rejected Istishfa from graves...[/quote]

All this is mere slander and speculation from the broken pen and twisted tongue of “Abu Alqama” – the one who posted in the past with different screen names to deceive the masses with much distortion against mainly the Ahnaf!

Those names listed above (Saqqaf, Alawi Maliki, Mamduh) are not our Imams who reached the level of Ijtihad, nor are they Ahnaf or Huffaz of Hadith. Nor is al-Kawthari our Imam or hujja unlike al-Albani is to your likes – the one who made enormous mistakes in Hadith!

These names all agreed with Ibn Kathir and ibn Hajar that Malik al-Dar’s narration is Sahih, as did others from this age.

Your claim that al-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar weakened narrations on raful yadayn – I ask where and which narrations?! I have seen Ibn Hajar authenticate some non-raful yadayn narrations in *al-Diraya*.

What has this got to do with Malik al-Dar anyway?! In fact, al-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar listed Malik al-Dar as being a Sahabi – so he was adil to them and not majhul like you claimed with no significant dalil O abased one who writes with hawa, ta'assub, poor English, nay undecipherable words at times by over relying on your own pre-conceived bias and false notions derived from your own biased Ulama like al-Albani, Bin Baz, Ibn Uthaymin, Hammad al-Ansari, al-Jaza'iri etc – who were all men of this time and none of them were agreed upon to be Huffaz of Hadith let alone totally sound in aqeeda!

As for Mamduh and that Juz see here for what we think and we are not fanatically attached to him as you are to the likes of al-Albani:

<http://www.sunniforum.com/forum/showpost.php?p=119176&postcount=18>



A challenge to Abu Alqama and his Imams in Aqeeda:

Ya Abu Alqama, O bold braggart - tell us where the following narration that ibn al-Qayyim said was reported by Imam Ahmad and blindly affirmed by Ibn Uthaymin is actually found. Ibn Uthaymin claimed in his Fatawa (vol. 1, no. 57):

وأما تفسيره بالجلوس فقد نقل ابن القيم في الصواعق 1303/4 عن خارجة بن مصعب في قوله تعالى: (الرحمن على العرش استوى) (1) قوله: "وهل يكون الاستواء إلا الجلوس".
ا.هـ. وقد ورد ذكر الجلوس في حديث أخرجه الإمام أحمد عن ابن عباس رضي الله
عنهما مرفوعاً. والله أعلم

The last point from Ibn Uthaymin that julus is found in a narration reported by Imam Ahmed as a Marfu narration from Ibn Abbas (ra) is found in the words of ibn al-Qayyim in his *al-Ijtima al-Juyush al-Islamiyya* (p. 70) as follows:

وفي مسند الإمام أحمد من حديث ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما قصة الشفاعة الحديث
بطوله مرفوعاً وفيه فآتي ربي عز وجل فأجده على كرسيه أو سريره جالسا

I ask you to show me where it is in the Musnad of Ahmed if you can. If you can't find it – then where did Ibn Qayyim get it from?! Tell us what is the status of ibn al-Qayyim and ibn Uthaymin for mentioning that Istiwa means Julus?!! Tell us why Ibn al-Qayyim and ibn Uthaymin both quote Kharija ibn Mus'ab as their reference to say that Istiwa is by julus – when Kharija is Matruk to Ibn Hajar and accused of lying also?!

Then, if you can't show us that the above narration is not in the Musnad with those specific words and it has been forged – tell us who is worse? Mamduh/Himyari did not forge any narration, unlike ibn al-Qayyim who went further to establish a point of aqeeda that istiwa is Julus – on top of their belief that istiwa is bi-dhatihi and istiqrar!! We do know who the Mushabbiha are and how that comes to be linked with Shirk, rather than Tawhid as you and your ilk shout about so constantly.

Lâ hawla wala quwwata Illa billah!

The reader can compare and contrast how we have tried our utmost best to quote authoritative statements – but the likes of Abu Alqama can only rant and rave in the main and not produce hardly any genuine quote to prove the veracity of their claims. On top of that, can the average reader follow the incoherent and garbled sentences that this Hashwi known as “Abu Alqama” has been spurting out from his vile and broken mindset?!

He thinks he knows the Hanafi Madhhab better than our own Ulama, so let him look into these quotes before he attempts to reply with further futility, distortions, unwarranted digressions, puerile abuse and declaring people to be “Quburiyya” regarding Tawassul:

1- وقال مجد الدين الموصلي الحنفي (ت: 683 هـ) صاحب الاختيار فيما يقال عند زيارة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم (جئناك من بلاد شاسعة . . . والاستشفاع بك إلى ربنا) ثم يقول :
مستشفعين بنبيك إليك
ومثله في الطحاوي على الدر المختار

ابن أبي الوفاء القرشي الحنفي (ت: 775 هـ): يتوسل "بجاه رسول الله" طبقات الحنفية -2
(353/1).

3- الإمام كمال الدين بن الهمام الحنفي رضى الله عنه (ت: 861 هـ) فتح القدير، ج2، ص332،
كتاب الحج، باب زيارة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم
ويسأل الله حاجته متوسلا إلى الله بحضرة نبيه ثم قال يسأل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الشفاعة
فيقول يا رسول الله أسألك الشفاعة يا رسول الله أتوسل بك إلى الله

4- وزاد الشيخ علي القاري المكي الحنفي (ت: 1014 هـ) في شرح الشمائل: "فليس لنا شفيع غيرك نؤمله، ولا رجاء غير بابك نصله، فاستغفر لنا واشفع لنا إلى ربك يا شفيع المذنبين، واسأله أن يجعلنا من عباده الصالحين".

5- ذكر الشرنبلالي الحنفي (ت: 1069 هـ) في مراقي الفلاح في آداب الزيارة-

:يقف عند رأسه الشريف ويقول

اللهم انك قلت وقولك الحق: (ولو أنهم إذ ظلموا أنفسهم جاءوك فاستغفروا الله واستغفر لهم الرسول لوجدوا الله توابا رحيمًا) وقد جئناك سامعين قولك، طائعين أمرك، مستشفعين بنبيك، ربنا اغفر لنا ولإخواننا الذين سبقونا بالإيمان، ولا تجعل في قلوبنا غلا للذين آمنوا، ربنا انك رؤوف رحيم، ربنا آتنا في الدنيا حسنة وفي الآخرة حسنة وقنا عذاب النار، سبحان ربنا رب العزة عما يصفون، وسلام على المرسلين، والحمد لله رب العالمين .
ويدعو بما يحضره من الدعاء

:وفي مراقي الفلاح أيضا

روى سعيد بن منصور وسمرة بن حبيب وحكم بن عمير قالوا : إذا سوي على الميت قبره وانصرف الناس كانوا يستحبون أن يقال للميت عند قبره يا فلان قل لا إله إلا الله ثلاث مرات يا فلان قل ربّي الله ودينّي الإسلام ونبيّي محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم اللهم إني أتوسل إليك بحبيبك المصطفى أن ترحم فاقتي بالمت على الإسلام والإيمان وأن تشفع فينا نبيك عليه أفضل الصلاة . والسلام

خاتمة اللغويين الحافظ مرتضى الزبيدي الحنفي (ت:1089هـ)، قال في خاتمة "تاج العروس" -6-
."داعياً: "ولا يكلنا إلى أنفسنا فيما نعمله وننويه (((بمحمد وآله))) الكرام البررة

أبو الحسنات اللكنوي (ت:1264هـ): "متوسلاً بنبيه" الرفع والتكميل 27- 7-

العلامة الفقيه عبد الغني الغنيمي الحنفي (ت:1298هـ) صاحب "اللباب في شرح الكتاب"، قال -8-
في خاتمة كتابه "شرح العقيدة الطحاوية" داعياً: "وصلّ وسلم على سيدنا محمد فإنه (((أقرب من
."(((يُتوسل به إليك

خاتمة المحققين الشيخ ابن عابدين الحنفي، قال في مقدمة حاشيته على الدر المختار داعياً: "وإني -9-
."أسأله تعالى (((متوسلاً إليه بنبيه المكرم))) صلى الله عليه وسلم

الشيخ محمد علاء الدين ابن الشيخ ابن عابدين، قال في خاتمة تكملة حاشية والده داعياً: -10
"كان الله له ولوالديه، وغفر له ولأولاده ولمشايخه ولمن له حق عليه (((بجاه سيد الأنبياء
))). والمرسلين".

(وقال العدوي الحمزاوي في كثر المطالب (ص 216-11):
ومن أحسن ما يقول بعد تجديد التوبة في ذلك الموقف الشريف، وتلاوة (ولو أنهم إذ ظلموا أنفسهم
جاءوك فاستغفروا الله واستغفر لهم الرسول) الآية: نحن وفدك يا رسول الله وزوارك، جئناك
لقضاء حقك وللتبرك بزيارتك والاستشفاع بك مما أثقل ظهورنا واطلم قلوبنا

ويقول (ص 230): ويتوسل بهم إلى الله في بلوغ آماله، لان هذا المكان محل مهبط الرحمات
الربانية، وقد قال خير البرية عليه الصلاة وأزكى التحية: إن لربكم في دهركم نفحات، ألا
فتعرضوا لنفحات ربكم. ولا شك ولا ريب أن هذا المكان محل هبوط الرحمات الإلهية، فينبغي
للزائر أن يتعرض لهاتيك النفحات الاحسانية، كيف لا ؟ وهم الأحبة والوسيلة العظمى إلى الله
ورسوله، فجدير لمن توسل بهم أن يبلغ المنى وينال بهم الدرجات العلى، فانهم الكرام لا
يخيب قاصدهم وهم الأحياء، ولا يرد من غير إكرام زائرهم

أبو منصور الكرمانى الحنفى: في آداب زيارة قبر النبي- صلى الله عليه وسلم-: "ويقول إن -12
".فلان وفلان يستشفع بك يا رسول الله

في كتاب الفتاوى الهندية (ج1/266) كتاب المناسك: باب: خاتمة في زيارة قبر النبي صلى
الله عليه وسلم، بعد أن ذكر كيفية وآداب زيارة قبر الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم، ذكر الأدعية
التي يقولها الزائر فقال: "ثم يقف (أي الزائر) عند رأسه صلى الله عليه وسلم كالأول ويقول:
اللهم إنك قلت وقولك الحق: "وَلَوْ أَنَّهُمْ إِذْ ظَلَمُوا أَنْفُسَهُمْ جَاءُوكَ.." الآية، وقد جئناك سامعين
(((قولك طائعين أمرك،))) (مستشفعين بنبيك إليك

:أبو إسحاق الحنبدى الكازروني: كان من شعره-14
خافت النار إلاها فانتحت تتشفع لائذة بالرسول

وقال خليل أحمد سهارنبوري (المتوفي 1349 هـ) في كتابه المهند على المفند (ص 86-87) -15 وهو من كبار علماء أحناف ديوبند بالهند، في جواب هذا السؤال: هل للرجل أن يتوسل في دعوته بالنبي والصالحين والصديقين والشهداء والأولياء؟
عندنا وعند مشايخنا يجوز التوسل بهم في حياتهم وبعد وفاتهم بأن يقول: "اللهم إني أتوسل إليك" بفلان أن تجيب دعوتي وتقضي حاجتي". كما صرح به الشاه محمد إسحاق الدهلوي والمهاجر المكي ورشيد أحمد الكنكومي. انتهى
وأيد ووافق على هذا الكتاب حوالي 75 نفرًا من علماء الأحناف الكبار في باكستان

Finally, tell us what you think of this quote mentioned by the Hanafi Imam of his time, that some declared as a Mujtahid, Imam Kamal ibn al-Humam (d. 861 AH), mentioning from Imam Abu Hanifa in his Fath al-Qadir (Sharh al-Hidaya) saying:

أن زيارة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قريبة من الوجوب ولما زار الإمام أبو حنيفة المدينة المنورة وقف أمام قبره الشريف وقال
يا أكرم الثقلين يا كثر الورى *** جد لي بجودك وأرضني برضاك
أنا طامع في الجود منك ولم يكن *** لأبي حنيفة في الأنام سواك

The crucial bit was translated by someone as follows:

"When Imam Abu Hanifa visited Medina, he stood in front of the honorable grave (of the Prophet) and said,

"O, most honorable of the Two Weighty Ones (humankind and jinn)!

O, treasure of mankind, shower your generosity upon me and please me with your pleasure.

I am aspiring for your generosity, and there is no one for Abu Hanifa in the world but you."

Will the likes of Abu Alqama be bold and blatant enough to shout shirk for all the above Ulama and the quotes from the books of the earlier Ahnaf? Or will they deny the fact that Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal allowed the Tawassul they call shirk today as reported in *al-Mansak* of al-Marwazi?!

In closing Ya Abu Alqama – If you hope to reply to this article then do so if you care with quotes from the earlier Ulama of Hadith, and not less acknowledged contemporaries who are not recognised as being the Ahlul Istiqra in matters related to Ulum al-Hadith. If you can not admit to this style and manner of consistent replying with verifiable references, then we see no valid reason to waste precious time and energy to address your broken and hard to decrypt grammatical farce, illogical insinuations, wilful digressions from the subject matter at hand, not to forget your flip-flopping inconsistencies and hilarious ranting and raving. May Allah guide you and me to the haqq alone. Amin.

Our last word being all praise is to Allah and peace and blessings upon Sayyidina Muhammad.

Abul Hasan Hussain Ahmed
London
June 2006/Jumada al-Awwal 1427 AH

House of Verification